

# The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1902.

## NOTES ON SOPHOCLES OEDIPUS TYRANNUS.

44-5 :

ὡς τοῖσιν ἐμπείροισι καὶ τὰς συμφορὰς  
ζώσας ὁρῶ μάλιστα τῶν βουλευμάτων.

I find what appears to be the key to this much discussed passage, in pressing the exact sense of συμφορὰ viz: *an accidental result*.

Hesychius gives συμφορὰ συντυχία. Herodotus, i. 32 πᾶν ἐστὶ ἄνθρωπος συμφορή.

But, much more important, is Aristotle's account of ἐμπειρία *Metaph.* 981 a. 14. It is derived from repeated μῆμαι. καὶ δοκεῖ σχεδὸν ἐπιστήμη καὶ τέχνη ὅμοιον εἶναι ἢ ἐμπειρία . . . . πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὸ πράττειν ἐμπειρία τέχνης οὐδὲν δοκεῖ διαφέρειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μ α λ λ ο ν ἐπιτυγχάνοντας ὁρῶμεν τοὺς ἐμπείρους τῶν ἀνευ τῆς ἐμπειρίας λόγον ἔχόντων. The ἐμπειρος succeeds by what seems to be a *fluke*: συμφορὰ is Oedipus' *fluke*, which might succeed here as his mother-wit succeeded (γνώμη κυρήσας 398) with the Riddle of the Sphinx.

Lastly, cf. Arist. *Eccles.* 475, for the more precise sense of συμφέρειν = *to turn out accidentally*.

Λόγος γέ τοι τις ἔστι τῶν γεραιτέρων,  
ὅσ' ἂν ἀνόητ' ἢ μῶρα βουλευσάμεθα,  
ἅπαντ' ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἡμῖν συμφέρειν.

Render thus: 'For, with men of experience, I see that even the accidental issues of their counsel have a peculiar virtue.' By this version καὶ is explained; all the others leave it more or less otiose.

198: τέλει γὰρ εἴ τι νῦν ἀφῆ  
τοῦτ' ἐπ' ἡμᾶρ ἐχρεταί.

I believe the MS. reading is sound, and venture to propose for τέλει the sense of  
NO. CXLIV. VOL. XVI.

'tale,' 'fixed or destined number,' 'completion.' 'If Night remit (or forgo) anything to the tale of victims, Day falls upon that.' Such a sense appears to be the common idea which connects all the various usages—e.g. the military, and the financial.

That (with ἀφίεναι in the sense of *remit* or *forgo*) we have τέλει not τέλους is explained if we consider that the debt and the debtors are the same—the people of Thebes; therefore it is indifferent whether you say 'make any abatement *for* the tale of victims' or 'of the tale of victims.'

457: φανήσεται δὲ παῖσι τοῖς αὐτοῦ ξυνὸν  
ἀδελφός

I do not recollect ever seeing this favourite Sophoclean idiom stated. Where the plain verb εἶναι would be grammatically sufficient he improves its significance by compounding it with such preposition as indicates the general idea of the sentence.

O.C. 7: ὁ χρόνος ξυνὸν

μακρός  
O.C. 773: πόλιν τέ μοι  
ξυνούσαν εἶνον

O.C. 946: ὅτῳ γάμοι  
ξυνόντες ἡϊρέθησαν . . .

(So also παρῇ for ἦ in O.C. 498).

*Ajax* 267: κοινὸς ἐν κοινοῖσι λυπεῖσθαι ξυνόν.

*Ajax* 338: τοῖς πάλοι  
νοσήμασι ξυνούσι λυπεῖσθαι παρών.

(So also ξυνῆλθον for ἦλθον in *Ajax* 491).

*Ajax* 610: ξύνεστιν ἔφεδρος = ἐφεδρεῖν.

*Ajax* 855: κακέϊ προσανδήσω ξυνόν  
= κακέϊ ὡν προσανδήσω

cf. also ἀπεισιν in Philoct. 161.

Z

In *O.T.* 863 : εἰ μοι ξυνείη φέροντι  
Μοῖρα

I am inclined to believe that we have this same intensive compounding with ξυν-, and that the words simply = εἰ μοι μοῖρα εἴη φέρειν. Participle for infinitive is another favourite Sophoclean variation.

And lastly Antigone's

οὐ τοι συνεχθεῖν ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφην  
exhibits the same trick of language.

779 φοιτᾷ γὰρ ὑπ' ἀγρίαν  
ἔλαν ἀνά τ' ἄντρα καὶ  
πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος.

So the first hand in L.

Mr. Whitelaw makes a complete defence for πετραῖος = ἀνὰ πέτρας. But the employment of the article in this pregnant sense is also defensible. From examples like *Agamemnon* 833

φίλον τὸν εὐτυχοῦντ' ἄνεν φθόνου σέβειν  
(= one who unites the characters of a friend  
and a lucky man).  
and *O.T.* 1153

μὴ . . . τὸν γέροντά μ' αἰκίσῃ  
(= old age as represented by me)

and *Arist. Eq.* 1024

σφύζεσθαί με τὸν κύνα

(= me as representing the dog),

we may pass to the usage of the article throughout the description of the marionettes in *Xen. Symp.* ix. where ὁ Διόνυσος and ἡ Ἀριάδνη mean throughout 'the one who represented' D. and A. respectively. And finally two very strong cases in the Atticists :

Aeschines *Epist.* x. (p. 39 Hercher)

ἐκθορὸν ἐκ τῶν θάμνων ὁ Σκάμανδρος Κίμων.

i.e. 'Scamander represented by Cimon';

Lucian, *Alexander* 39.

ἐδαδούγει δὲ καὶ ἱεροφάντει ὁ Ἐνδυμίων  
Ἀλέξανδρος.

i.e. *Endymion represented by Alexander.*

Given this idiom of the pregnant use of the article, I think we may retain L's reading and render : 'He roams about the wild-wood and the caverns, and upon the rocks, playing bull,' the bull being a type of a moping seclusion—ὁ δὲ ταῦρος ἐβόσκειτο μοῦνος ἄν' ἄλλων.

624-5 :

Cr. *ὅταν προδείξῃς οἶόν ἐστι τὸ φθονεῖν.*

OED. *ὡς οὐχ ὑπέκωον οὐδὲ πιστεύων λέγεις ;*

Cr. Not till you have made plain the quality of your grudge.

OED. You speak in defiance and refusal to obey !

Cr. Yes, for etc., etc.

Jebb's emendation of *ὅταν* to *ὡς ἂν*, transference of 624 to Oedipus, and consequent supposition of a lacuna between 625-6 seem needlessly violent measures.

φθόνος can be used of a particular grudge not merely of envy in general : e.g. *Aesch. Eum.* 686 :

Θησέως κατὰ φθόνον

στρατηλατοῦσαι

And what might appear to be an even more necessarily general expression, the infinitive as noun, is used by Herodotus ix. 79 in a particular application

τὸ μὲν εἰνοεῖν καὶ τὸ προορᾶν ἀγαμαί σεν.

Oedipus threatens instant death ; Creon retorts 'You are bound first to show the quality (or nature) of your grudge'—which to Oedipus is 'defiance and insubordination.'

As for πιστεύειν = to obey, even apart from the passages in *Trach.* 1228 and 1251, when we consider how Sophocles played upon the the philological ambiguity in ἀπειθής, ἀπιστος, ἀπειθεῖν, ἀπιστεῖν (fr. *Aethiopes* 30, fr. 45) and even Aeschylus' ἀπιστεῖν for ἀπειθεῖν (*P.V.* 640), we are hardly justified in declaring it impossible.

694-6 :

ὅς τ' ἐμὲ γὰρ φίλαν . . .

οὐρίσας,

τανῖν τ' εὐποπος εἰ δύναιο γενοῦ.

L (o add. Σ.)

γενοῦ is a gloss. The unsupported εἰ δύναιο might perhaps be defended by a form of sentence like *Plato Laches* 179 E

καὶ ὑμᾶς συμπααραλαβεῖν ἅμα μὲν συνθεατάς,  
ἅμα δὲ συμβούλους τε καὶ κοινόνους ἐν βούλῃ σθε.

880 :

τὸ καλῶς δ' ἔχον

πόλει πάλασμα μήποτε λύσαι θεὸν αἰτοῦμαι  
"But I pray that the god never quell such rivalry as benefits the State."—Jebb.

I cannot satisfy myself that the singular neuter verbal noun will bear this abstract general sense ; and would therefore take πάλασμα as the *bout* or *ordeal* which Oedipus happily won in overthrowing the Sphinx and render

'But I pray God may never undo the triumph gained (by Oedipus) in his national ordeal.'

1276-80 :

φοίνιαι δ' ὁμοῦ

γλῆναι γένει' ἔτεγγον οὐδ' ἀνίσταν

φόνον μυδώσας σταγόνας, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ μέλας

ὁμβρος χαλάζης αἵματοῦς ἐτέγγετο.

Surely Sophocles could not have written ὄρνυ . . . ὄρνυ and not meant them to correspond, as in *O.T.* 4, 5. Give to ὄρνυ the sense of 'and relaxed not' (cf. *Eur. I.T.* 318) and render, 'All the while bloody eyeballs bedewed his beard with

slimy beads and relaxed not; all the while, etc.

1350: *ρομάδ* may be vindicated by Suidas: *ρομάδης* ὁ ἰδιώτης βίος. In *Eur. Cycl.* 120 the connotation seems not to be 'roaming' but 'living wild.' J. S. PHILLIMORE.

## REMARKS ON THE CULEX.

THE authors of the *Culex* and *Ciris* and *Aetna* were mediocre poets, and worse; and the gods and men and booksellers whom they affronted by existing allotted them for transcription to worse than mediocre scribes. The *Ciris* was indited by a twaddler, and the *Culex* and *Aetna* by stutterers: but what they stuttered and twaddled was Latin, not double-Dutch; and great part of it is now double-Dutch, and Latin no more. The deep corruption of the MSS is certified not merely by the jargon which they offer us, but by other and external proofs. For 150 verses of the *Aetna* we have the fragmentum Gyrardinum, and it reveals, for instance, that the MSS on which we depend for the bulk of the poem have altered u. 227 '*ingenium sacrare caputque attollere caelo*' into '*sacra per ingentem capitique attollere caelum*.' For 100 verses of the *Ciris* we have the codex Bruxellensis, and it tells us that the other MSS have substituted *secum heu* for *eheu* at 469 and *uezaruit et aegros* for *uezarier undis* at 481. In the *Culex* the MS on which we chiefly rely can here and there be tested by other authorities, and they prove that it has corrupted *Zanclaea* to *metuenda* at 332 and *cui cessit Lydi timefacta* to *legitime cessit cui facta* at 366. Such are the scribes, and that is half the difficulty: then there are the poets. Just as it is hard to tell, in Statius or Valerius Flaccus, whether this or that absurd expression is due to mis-copying or to the divine afflatus of the bard, so in the *Culex* and *Ciris* and *Aetna* it is for ever to be borne in mind that they are the work of poetasters. Many a time it is impossible to say for certain where the badness of the author ends and the badness of the scribe begins. And many a time, when the guilt is firmly saddled on the copyist, there is no more to be done except sit down and sigh; because in such corruptions as *metuenda* for *Zanclaea* all vestige of the truth has vanished: etiam periere ruinae.

Here then, between poets capable of much and copyists capable of anything, is a pro-

misg field for the exercise of tact and caution: a prudent editor will be slow to emend the text and slow to defend it, and his page will bristle with the obelus. But alas, it is not for specimens of tact and caution that one resorts to the editors of the *Culex*; it is rather to fill one's bosom with sheaves of improbable corrections and impossible explanations. In particular the editions of Baehrens in 1880 and of Leo in 1891 are patterns of insobriety.

Witness one piece of precipitate blundering, which I select from many others, not because it is more flagrant than the rest, but because there is no denying it; it is convicted not merely by sense and reason, which are easily set aside, but by *euentus*, *stultorum magister*. The MS text of 365 sq. stood as follows:

Mucius et prudens ardorem corpore passus,  
legitime cessit cui facta potentia regis.

Baehrens took 367 '*hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille*' and placed it after 365; he took 368 '*Flaminius deuota dedit qui corpora flammae*,' threw away the last five words and altered the sole survivor to *Fabricius* with Heyne; struck off *legitime* from 366, clapped *Fabricius* in its stead, changed *facta* with the old editors to *fracta*; and behold—

Mucius et prudens ardorem corpore passus;  
hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille  
Fabricius, cessit cui fracta potentia regis.

Mr Leo retained the MS text with the one change of *facta* to *fracta*, and wrote this note: '*potentia regis legitime*, i.e. iure cessit uirtuti omni ui ac potentia destitutae, legitimum scilicet in regiam potestatem imperium uirtus exercuit. qui uocabuli usus licet, si lexicis fides, exemplis careat, tam apte quadrat ad ipsam rem et uocabuli naturam, ut de ueritate lectionis nullus dubitem.'

The cod. Corsinianus discovered by Mr. Ellis gives in 366 *cui cessit lidithime*; that is *cui cessit Lydi timefacta potentia regis*.

En hic declarat quales sitis iudices. But it is not because they happen to be proved wrong that I condemn these treatments of the passage, for even prudent criticism may be wrong: it is because they are not prudent; because they exhibit confidence and credulity where everything counselled hesitation and scepticism.

Of the MSS of the Culex, B, cod. Bembinus saec. ix, is not only much the oldest but also in general the most trustworthy. But there are two others, later and on the whole less faithful, which in certain passages far excel it: Γ, cod. Corsinianus saec. xiv uel xv, and V, cod. Vossianus saec. xv. I will cite the most important readings of both, premising that some of them may be only conjectural emendations, but that others of them must be genuine and all of them may.

Γ. 15 *asterie* Γ, *astrigeri* B. 192 *detraxit ab arbore truncum* Γ, *truncum detraxit ab ore* B. 210 *quis inquit*] *quid inquit* Γ, *inquit quid* B. 337 *Troia ruenti*] *troias ruenti* Γ, *troia furenti* B. 352 *laetans*] *laetam* Γ, *laetum* B. 362 *moritura camilli* Γ, *mora melli* B. 366 *cui cessit lidithime* Γ, *legitime cessit cui* B.

V. 60 *spretis* V, *pretiis* B. 93 *liget* V, *licet* B. 237 *tue...ire* V, *tuas...iras* B. 249 *uocordem* V, *ui cordam* B. 304 *talis...* *belli* V, *tali...bellis* B. 330 *ipse* V, om. B. 332 *Zancleae*] *ranolea* V, *metuenda* B. 340 *ne quisquam* V, *neque* B. 343 *Argea*] *argoa* V, *argore* B. 378 *mali nec* V, *malignae* B. 390 *propter* V, *praeter* B.

Γ and V. 2 *orsum* ΓV, *ursum* B. 10 *poliantur* ΓV, *spoliantur* B. 311 *uiridantibus* (= *feridantibus*) *feritatis* ab ΓV, *feritatis* et B. 312 *Ida* ΓV, *daque* B. 355 *egea* ΓV, *erea* B. 357 *omnis in aequoreo* *fluitat* ΓV, *fluctuat omnis in aequoreo* B. 399 *pubibunda ruborem* ΓV, *rubibunda terrorem* B.

Mark that B, at 192, 210, 312, 332, 357, 366, is proven guilty of gross and deliberate interpolation; and that B is the best MS. *vāfe kai mēvao* ἀπιστεῖν.

94, 95.

o pecudes, o Panes, et o gratissima tempe fontis Hamadryadum.

'tempe fontis' is naught; 'gratissima fontis' (propter fontem) is almost incredible; either construction is further encumbered by the second genitive 'Hamadryadum'; and no such change as Heinsius' 'frondis'

<sup>1</sup> For *uir* and *fer* confused see Prop. ii 6 24, On. her. ix 141.

will be any help. I expect some noun in apposition with 'tempe' and signifying 'abode' or 'resort': Mr Leo's 'hortus' is well enough; but since the model of these verses is Verg. georg. ii 469 'frigida tempe' I propose

gratissima tempe,  
frigus Hamadryadum.

That is 'sedes frigida': Mart. iv 64 14 'quodecumque iacet sub urbe frigus'.

FRIGUS = FRIQVS and *frius* = *fnotis*. Lest this progress in error should seem at all unlikely, let us pursue the adventures of the word *Zancleae* in 332. The archetype had *zanclea*: *z = r* and *c = o*, so in V appears *ranolea*. But also *z = t*, *a = u*, *cl = d*, and hence arose *tundea* (see Sil. i 662 *Zancelen* corrupted to *tandem* and *tandes*), which was altered by transposing one letter to the nearest Latin word *tuenda* (so *fnotis*, *fontis*), and then enlarged for metre's sake to *me-tuenda*, which is in B. Then the *m* was absorbed in the *m* preceding it, and (*m*)*etuenda*, since *n = ri*, appears in Γ as *et uerida*.

137, 138.

hic magnum Argoae naui decus edita pinus  
proceros decorat siluas hirsuta per artus.

*edita* B, *adita* V, *addita* Γ as Heinsius and Schrader had conjectured. *addita* may of course be right (Schrader lib. emend. p. 24 quotes Verg. Aen. viii 301 and Stat. Theb. i 22), but the *edita* of B will yield unimpeachable sense, provided you avoid the blunders of Heyne and Mr Leo, who explain '*edita*, excelsa (cf. inf. 170)' and '*naui edita pinus* dictum est ut u. 171 *cui crista superne edita*.' *naui decus edita* means *genita ad nauem decorandam*. Compare on the one hand 401 'Cilici crocus *editus* aruo,' and on the other On. amor. ii 5 4 'ei mihi perpetuum nata puella malum,' Hes. op. 804 Ὀρκον...τὸν Ἐρις τέκε πῆμ' ἐπιόρκους, hymn Hom. Merc. 160 sq. μεγάλην σε πατὴρ ἐφύτ-ενσε μέριμναν | θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι, and finally cul. 265-267

ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus Icarotis  
femineum concepta decus manet et procul  
illam  
turba ferox iuuenum telis confixa procorum.

*illam* BΓ, *illa* V et edd. On these verses there is not one blot but two: it is fruitless to remove the ungrammatical *illam* (into which *illa* would hardly have been altered) without removing also the ridiculous repetition of *decus*. *manet* too, as the words now stand, is a trifle foolish. The phrase



'concepta decus femineum,' as Ribbeck has seen, signifies 'ideo concepta ut feminarum decus esset': the second *decus* must give place to something which will render *illam* grammatical; and the form of the sentence may be thus restored:

ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus Icarioris  
femineum concepta manet, <paueat> et  
procul illam  
turba ferox iuuenum telis confixa procorum.

Of course I cannot answer for the verb, which may have been *timet* or *cauet* or *fugit* or *uidet*. The construction is 'Icarioris, decus femineum concepta, semper manet Ithaci coniunx.'

178—189.

naturae comparat arma :  
ardet mente, furit stridoribus, intonat  
ore,

flexibus euersis torquetur corporis  
orbis,

manant sanguineae per tractus undique  
guttae,

spiritibus rumpit fauces. cui cuncta  
parantur,

paruulus hunc prior umoris conterret  
alumnus

et mortem uitare monet per acumina;  
namque,

qua diducta genas pandebant lumina  
gemmis,

hac senioris erat naturae pupula telo  
icta leui, cum prosiluit furibundus et  
illum

obtritum morti misit; cui dissitus  
omnis

spiritus et cessit sensus. tum cet.

182 *parant* scripsi, *paranti* libri. *cui* refers to the following *hunc*: 'eum, cui cuncta parantur, prior conterret culex': so 410 sq. 'et, quoscumque nouant uernantia tempora flores, | his tumulus super inseritur.' Scaliger wrote 'quo cuncta *parante*,' and certainly the dative *cui* (serpenti) *paranti*, which Mr Leo makes to depend on *prior*, is unaccountable: but even with this change the *hunc* of 183, referring to *ducem gregis* far away in 175, remains very poor and bare.

189 *et cessit* scripsi, *excessit* libri. *cessit* ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, 'cessit spiritus et sensus,' as 170 sq. 'attollit nitidis pectus fulgoribus et se | sublimi ceruice caput,' i.e. 'attollit se pectus et caput,' and 328 'Rhesi uictorque Dolonis.' See Lucr. iii 356 'at dimissa anima corpus caret undique sensu.' *excessit sensus* is said to mean 'excessit e sensibus': and pray what may be the meaning of 'spiritus excessit e sensibus'?

192—197.

ualidum dextra detraxit ab arbore  
truncum

(qui casus sociarit opem numenue  
deorum

prodere sit dubium, ualuit sed uincere  
tales

horrida squamosi uoluentia membra  
draconis)

atque reluctantis crebris foedeque  
petentis

ictibus ossa ferit, cingunt qua tempora  
cristae.

195

The MS reading of 193 *qui...numenue*, retained by Heyne, is defensible and means 'dubium sit prodere qui casus quodue numen sociarit': see *Ou. met.* xiv 162 'qui te casusue deusue | seruat, Achaemenide?' Scaliger proposed *cui* for *qui*, and this gross solecism, excusable in the 16th century (though even then Lambinus knew better), is repeated in the 19th by Haupt and Mr Leo. The *numenue* of V will make Latin of it, and may be right, since 'sociarit' is all the better for having a dative; but it is awkward here to designate the shepherd by the relative pronoun, so we had best content ourselves with the text of B.

194 *tales* BF, *tali* V. When Sillig and the subsequent editors write *talis* (qualis, quales?) they are only erasing a vestige of the truth: the corruption is in *horrida*. Propertius, and Horace in his satires (for Verg. *Aen.* xi 309 is no parallel), are the only poets between Lucretius and Prudentius who are known to admit such corruptions as 'horridā squamosi'; and the diction of 'horrida uoluentia membra' is equally ἐπὶ ὀνυχοῖς, horridum. In Virgil's 'tardaque Eleusinae matris uoluentia plaustra' *tarda* adheres adverbially to *uoluentia*, which *horrida* cannot: uoluenti actio tarda esse potest, horrida non item. *tales* survives to tell us what manner of word stood once in *horrida*'s stead: it was a spondaic acc. plur. substantive, 'ualuit uincere squamosi draconis membra tales — uoluentia': the order of the words is quite legitimate in any poet, let alone a poet who writes 205 'in fessos requiem dare comparat artus' for 'dare fessos artus in requiem'. The sense is satisfied by *orbes*: I know no suitable word which could easily be mistaken for *horrida*, but here is one which could easily be lost before *squamosi*:

ualuit sed uincere tales  
<spiras> squamosi uoluentia membra  
draconis.

i.e. *squassuamosi*. Verg. georg. ii 153 sq. 'tanto | *squameus* in *spiram* tractu se colligit anguis'.

I have made a similar correction in 266 (on 137 above); and here are others: 292—296.

sed tu crudelis, crudelis tu magis, Orpheu,  
oscula cara petens rupisti iussa deorum:  
dignus amor uenia, <ueniam> si Tartara  
nossent.  
peccatum meminisse grauest.

This is one of the few places in the culex where Baehrens has distinguished himself: he has restored *ueniam* for *gratum*. The emendation is as certain as Bentley's *Parin Paris* for *Parin creat* in Verg. Aen. x 705: with Virgil's 'ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere manes' before his eyes it was impossible for the poet to write otherwise.

385—391.

hunc ubi sollicitum dimisit inertia  
uitae,

quantumcumque sibi uires tribuere  
seniles, 388

conformare locum capit impiger.

*sibi uires* BΓ, *uires sibi* V. The use of *sibi* for *ei*, though incorrect, is not unexampled; but this unmetrical variant of V points to

*sibi*  
*uires* in the archetype, and I conjecture

quantumcumque <uiro> uires tribuere  
seniles.

Compare moret. 107 'saepe uiri nares' &c.

216—221.

praeda Charontis agor: uidi ut flagrantia  
taedis

lumina, cum lucent in festis omnia  
templis.

obuia Tisiphone, serpentibus undique

compta,

et flammas et saeua quatit mihi uerbera;

pone

Cerberus est, diris flagrans latratibus ora, 220

anguibus hinc atque hinc horrent cui  
colla reflexis.

217 in *festis* scripsi, *infestis* libri. 219  
pone Haupt, *pone est* iam Peerlkamp, *poenae*  
libri. 220 *est* scripsi, *et* libri. *flagrans*  
Scaliger, *flagrant* libri. nolo conicere  
'Cerberus et diris *flagrat* latratibus *Orthrus*.'

For the elision 'uidi ut' see 288 'dirae exorabile'; for 'ut' in the sense of 'tam-

quam' see 2 'atque ut araneoli tenuem formauimus orsum,' i.e. formauimus orsum tamquam araneoli orsum. The meaning is 'uidi lumina eius tamquam lumina taedis flagrantia cum omnia lucent in festis templis,' 'I have beheld his eyes, as it were the flaming light of torches when temples are all ablaze with festival.' Virgil Aen. vi 300 says of Charon 'stant lumina flamma' and Seneca H. f. 767 'concauae lucent genae.' The phrase 'flagrantia taedis | lumina' is imitated from Aen. vi 593 sq. 'fumea taedis | lumina,'<sup>1</sup>

243—253.

quid, saxum procul aduerso qui monte  
reuoluit,

contempsisse dolor quem numina uincit  
acerbus?

otia quaerentem frustra bitis? ite, 245

puellae,

ite, quibus taedas accendit tristic Erinys.

sic in, 'Hymen' praefata, dedit co-  
nubia Mortis?

atque alias alio densas super agmine

turmas,

impietate fera uecordem Colchida

matrem,

anxia sollicitis meditantem uulnera

natis; 250

iam Pandionias miserandi prole

puellas,

quarum uox Ityn edit Ityn, quo Bisto-

nus rex

orbis epops maeret uolucres euectus in

auras.

245 *frustrabit is* scripsi, *frustra sibilis* B (*sublile* Γ), *frustra ceu uile* V. The easiest change from B is Heinsius' 'acerbus | otia quaerentem frustra sibi? ite,' and the hiatus can be defended by Verg. Aen. i 405. But the addition of 'otia' etc. weakens rather than strengthens what has been said of Sisyphus, and I assent to Mr Leo that we have here a phrase like 258 'eheu mutandus numquam labor' and Verg. Aen. vi 845 'quo fessum rapitis, Fabii?' referring to the gnat itself and preparing the transition

<sup>1</sup> I subjoin for comparison the readings of Baehrens and Leo.

Baehrens:

praeda Charontis agor *uigilis*. flagrantia taedis  
limina tum lucent infernis obdita templis.  
obuia Tisiphone cet.

Leo:

praeda Charontis agor. uiden ut flagrantia taedis  
limina collucent? infestis obuia templis,  
obuia Tisiphone cet.

from the men to the women of the underworld. Mr Leo conjectures *sinite, ite*: I think that *frustrabit* is better in itself and better explains the variation of the MSS; for no one can pretend that such nonsense as *ceuite* is an attempt to emend *siblite*.<sup>1</sup> This is one of several places where B and V have corrupted in different ways the reading of their common source: compare 249 *Colchida*] *conchida* B, *colchita* V, 269 *poenane*] *poenaeque* B, *pene* V, and especially 334 *generamen prolis*, where V preserves *generamen* but corrupts *prolis* to *probis*, I preserves *prolis* but corrupts *generamen* to *gener ante*, B corrupts both words, but only to the slightest extent, *generam plus* to *gener amplis*. So here the *siblite* of B arises from the transposition *frustra sibi ite*, the *ceuite* of V from the omission *frustra(itis)ite* = *frustra uite*.

247 *sicin scripsi, sicut libri*: idem error Prop. iii 6 9. 'sicut Hymen praefata' can be construed; but then the verses 246 and 247 are *harena sine calce* and want tying together with an *et* or a *quae*. With the interrogation compare Catull. 64 28 'tene Thetis tenuit' etc.

251 *miserandi scripsi, miserandas BV, miseranda F*, both of which are utterly absurd. Itys, ἡ τις ἀγιοῖ μαῖω, was not the offspring of Procne and Philomela. The only editor of the culex who seems to be aware of this is Heinsius, who proposes *miseranda sorte*: I have thought it safer to follow the MSS where they coincide and abandon them where they differ. *miserandi* agrees with the genitive contained in *Pandionias*: the construction is like Ou. amor. i 8 108 'mea defunctae ossa' or Liu. ii 53 1 'Veiens bellum, quibus Sabini arma coniunxerant', but the scribes knew not what to make of it. Pandion was 'miserandus prole', αἰωρόκος: Ou. met. vi 675 sq. 'hic dolor ante diem longaeque extrema senectae | tempora Tartareas Pandiona misit ad umbras'.

But now I come to the central difficulty of the passage, the verse 248 and the sentence to which it belongs. The accusatives *turmas, Colchida, puellas* have no construction; the apposition of *Colchida* with *turmas* is ridiculous; the word *turmas* is no name for companies of heroines unless they happen to be Amazons; and the phrase *alias alio super agmine turmas* is nonsense. The idiom *alius...alius* is employed in Latin with a single substantive for the purpose of

dividing a whole into parts: 'alias ex aliis fingendo moras', 'delay after delay'. Two substantives are never used in this idiom (*moras alias ex aliis cunctationibus*), because there is then no whole to be divided: the division has been made already, and the superaddition of *alius...alius* is not merely unexampled but unimaginable. The employment of *alius...alius* with a couple of substantives gives quite a different sense, and apportions the one to the other: 'legiones aliae alia in parte resistent', 'some legions in one spot, others in another'. The phrase *alias alio super agmine turmas* will not mean the same as *turmas alias super aliis*, 'troops upon troops': it will mean 'some troops upon one troop, others upon another'; which is nonsense, whatever language you write it in.

Therefore the passage is not simply corrupt, as most editors think, nor simply defective, as Mr Leo thinks, but both. The following is the irreducible minimum of correction:

< iam prope conspicio, uestram quae uertice  
turbam >

atque alias alto densas super eminent  
umbras,  
impietate fera uecordem Colchida matrem,  
anxia sollicitis meditantem uolnera natis;  
iam Pandionias cet.

The corruption sprang from *aemine turbas*; and the verse above may have fallen out through the likeness of *turmas (turbas V)* and *turbam*. For the distribution of *uertice* and *alto* on either side of the conjunction compare 12 'Phoebus erit nostri princeps et carminis auctor' and 196 sq. 'reluctantis crebris foedeque petentis | ictibus ossa ferit.' The confusion of *alto* with *alio* is common, and was here helped by the presence of *alias*: I will cite a perfect parallel from Manil. v 44. The man born under the constellation Argo, says Manilius, will become a seafarer,

totumque uolet transnare profundum  
classibus, atque alios menses aliumque  
uidere

Phasin, et.....Tiphyn superare.

I agree with Lachmann at Prop. i 1 12 that *alios menses* is quite sound and means 'new seasons,' 'an unfamiliar climate,' and that Val. Fl. vi 324 quoted by Bentley, where a Scythian says to an Argonaut '*alium hic miser aspicias annum*,' is a complete defence of the reading. Bentley, who denies this, says nothing in support of his denial; but

<sup>1</sup> Baehrens' 'otia quaerenti frustra cernice puellae' incurs the similar objection that it does not account for the reading of B.

his bad<sup>1</sup> conjecture *Minyas* for *menses*—quasi uero *uiderint* Argonautae *Minyas* ac non ipsi *Minyae* fuerint—shows that he perceived a difficulty which Lachmann overlooked. It is intolerable that *alios menses* should mean 'alios atque ipse adhuc uidit' when *alium Phasin* means 'alium ac uiderunt Argonautae.' Therefore one of the two must be altered, and that one is *alium Phasin*; cur enim *alium* potius quam eundem? Phasis is the eastern bourn of sailors as Gades and Atlas and Erythea are the western, Strab. p. 497 εἰς Φάσιν, ἔνθα ναυτῶν ἄρχατος ὁρίμος, (this is why fifteen years ago I transposed Prop. iii 22 15 sq. to stand before 7, κωφοῖς αὐτῶν): it is to Phasis, the same and not another, that the born mariner will sail: 'suo Colchum pro-pellet remige Phasin | Peliacaeque trabis totum iter ipse leget.' Write then 'alios menses a l t u m que uidere | Phasin': Val. Fl. iii 501 'Phasidis alti.'

296—324.

hic et uterque  
Aeacides (Peleus namque et Telamonia  
uirtus  
per secreta patris laetantur numina,  
quorum  
conubiis Venus et uirtus iniunxit hon-  
orem:  
hunc rapuit seruata, illum Nereis  
amauit)  
adsidet, hic iuuenes, sociatae gloria  
sortis:  
alter in ore ferens expressum a  
nauibz ignis  
Argolicis Phrygios torua feritate re-  
pulsos—  
(o quis non referat..... 304  
.....depellere nauibus instat) 321  
—hos erat Aeacides uultu laetatus  
honores;  
Dardaniaeque alter fuso quod sanguine  
campis  
Hector lustrauit deuicto corpore Troiam.

300 *seruata* (= *feritata*) scripsi, *ferit* ast BF, *feritas* V. The easiest conjecture is Bembus' *serua ast*, which has not enough relevance to the 'Virtus' of 299; the most appropriate is Mr Leo's *praeda ast*: I have tried to combine as well as may be the merits of the two. Telamona rapuit Hesione, quam ipse seruauerat: Hyg. fab. 89 'cum...Hesiones sors exisset et petris religata esset, Hercules et Telamon...eodem

<sup>1</sup> 'male Bentleium *Minyas* reposuisse patet' Lachmann.

uenerunt et cetum interfecerunt.' Compare also Ou. met. xi 216 sqq. 'nec pars militiae Telamon sine honore recessit, | Hesioneque data potitur. nam coniuge Peleus | clarus erat diua.'

301 hic Baehrens, *ha V, hac BF*, fortasse <et>. *iuuenes* scripsi, *iuuenis* libri. 'hic adsidet et uterque Aeacides (Peleus et Telamon) et iuuenes (Achilles et Ajax).' If Baehrens' conjecture is right, *hic et...hic* is an example of the idiom '*redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna*': certainly neither *hac* nor *ac* is defensible. *iuuenes* was doomed by the neighbourhood of *adsidet* to become *iuuenis*. The parenthesis 297–300 has a parallel in 169–173, 'iam magis atque magis corpus reuolubile uoluens | (attollit... here come four verses...flammarum) lumine toruo | metatib sese circum loca.' Now, after the mention of the 'iuuenes,' he begins 'alter' (i.e. Ajax), wanders off into a still longer parenthesis, and involves himself in an anacoluthon: 'alter' (Achilles) at length arrives in 323.

302 ore ferens expressum scripsi, *excisum* referens B (*excisum* I, *exceusum* V). Since *alter* in *referens excisum* was unmetrical, the words were transposed with as little scruple as when *detraxit ab (arb)ore truncum* 192 was altered to *truncum detraxit ab ore*, or *quid inquit* 210 to *inquit quid*, or *omnis in aequoreo fluctuat* 357 to *fluctuat omnis in aequoreo*, or *cui cessit legitime* 366 to *legitime cessit cui*. The construction of *expressum* with *ignes a nauibus repulsos (esse)* is the same as Verg. Aen. ix 92 '*prosit nostris in montibus ortus*'. The elision occurs in 73, 279, and, I do not doubt, 272, where Messrs. Birt, Leo, and Ribbeck, with dismal superstition, retain 'nec timuit Phlegethonta, *furens*, ardentibus undis' instead of writing *furent*<em>. My correction of 302 defends and is defended by the MS reading of 322 'hos erat Aeacides uultu laetatus honores', where the poet, at the end of his parenthesis, returns to what he said at the beginning. It is useless to discuss the proceedings of the editors.

In 324 I have taken *Hector* from V (*Hectora BF*) and *deuicto* from the cod. Helmstadiensis (*uictor de BTV*). Most editors read with Bembus *Hectoreo uictor lustrauit*; but see Ou. Ib. 333 sq. 'uel qui, quae fuerat tutatus moenia saepe, | corpore lustrauit non diuturna suo'.

342—346.

ibat in altum  
uis Argea petens patriam ditataque  
praeda



arcis Eriethoniae; comes huic erat aura  
secunda  
per placidum cursu pelagus; Nereis ad  
undas 345  
signa dabat pars inflexis super iacta  
carinis.

*ad undas* in 345 is impossible, and modern editors read with Paldam *ab unda*. But how to explain the corruption? Thus:

comes huic erat aura secundans  
per placidum cursu pelagus; Nereis ab  
unda...

*undās* and *unda* were transposed. To write *cursus* (acc. plur.) for *cursu* in the next line would be a further improvement; but the absolute use of 'secundo' is well established, and 'currimus aequor' will justify 'placidum cursu pelagus' in the sense of 'smooth to sail over'. The *secundis* of *Γ* may indicate *ab undis* rather than *ab unda*.

In 346 the MSS vary thus: *pars inflexis* BV, *parsim flexis* *Γ*; *iacta* B, *icta* IV, *acta* codd. dett. et edd. The words 'pars inflexis super acta carinis' are supposed to mean 'pars Nereidum (though *Nereis*, not *Nereides*, has preceded) acta super inflexis carinis', and 'carinis' is supposed to mean 'curribus'. From the reading of *Γ* there at once emerges *passim flexis*, and I conjecture

signa dabat passim flexis super alta  
carinis.

'flexis super alta', steered over the sea: *carinis* is dative. Both *iacta* and *icta* may come from *acta*.

362—371.

hic et fama vetus numquam moritura  
Camilli,  
Curtius et, mediis quem quondam sedi-  
bus urbis  
deuotum bellis consumpsit gurgis in  
unda,  
Mucius et prudens ardorem corpore  
passus, 365  
cui cessit Lydi timefacta potentia regis;  
hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille  
flaminius deuota dedit qui corpora  
flammae.  
iure igitur talis sedes pietatis honores  
istarum piadasque duces, quorum deuota  
triumphis 370  
moenia rapidis Libycae Karthaginis  
horrent.

364. Heyne's *gurgitis unda* is an improvement and possibly right; but this is a poor

poet and we must not ask too much of him. *bellis* is plainly corrupt, and I think the easiest and aptest correction is *liuens* (= *libells*): see Catull. 17 10 sq. 'totius ut lacus putidaeque paludis | *liuidissima* maximeque est profunda uorago', Verg. Aen. vi 320 'uada *liuida* uerrunt'.

In Stat. silu. ii 6 38—44 are these words:

non tibi femineum uultu decus oraque supra  
mollis honos, quales dubiae discrimina formae  
de sexu transire iubent; toruque uirilīs  
gratia, nec petulans acies, blandique seuro  
igne oculi, qualis, *bellis* iam casside, uisu  
Parthenopaeus erat; simplexque horror de-  
coro  
crinis.

Most editors alter *iam*, which is very appropriate, and retain *bellis*, which is at best superfluous beside *casside*; Messrs. Krohn and Koltz have seen that an adjective should be restored, but they adopt Adrianus' frightful conjecture *bellus*; Baehrens' *liber* spoils the sense by laying stress on the placidity of this boy's looks when Statius is laying stress on their manliness. Write *liuens* iam casside, 'with the bruise of the helmet on his brow': Hor. carm. i 8 10 sq. '*liuida* gestat armis | braccia'.

368. Nothing is known of any such *Flaminius*: Nicolaus Loensis proposed *Caecilius*, and further, since the words as they stand are no description of Metellus' exploit in rescuing the Palladium, *lumina* for *corpora*. I offer this:

graminibus deuincta gerit qui tempora  
Flamma.

He imitates Verg. Aen. vi 772 'umbrata gerunt ciuili tempora quercu': see also Lygd. 6 2 'hedera tempora uincta geras' and Tib. ii 5 5 'triumphali deuinctus tempora lauro.' The confusion of *tempora* with *corpora* is common, as Ou. met. vii 429, her. ix 140, fast. iv 143: *deuotum* occurred in 364 and *deuota* will occur in 370, so we can dispense with it here: *dedit* for *gerit* was probably a deliberate alteration consequent on the other changes. I should not wonder if a verse<sup>1</sup> beginning with *Fabricius* had been lost between 367 and 368, and *Flaminius* were a mixture of *Fabricius* and *graminibus*.

Plin. n. h. xxii 11 'praeter hos contigit eius (i.e. gramineae) coronae honos M. Calpurnio Flammae tribuno militum in Sicilia,' Flor. i 18 13 'trepidatum est semel circa Camerin-

<sup>1</sup> Such as 'Fabricius, ducibusque aequata laude tribunus.'



ensium saltum, sed eximia uirtute Calpurni Flammar tribuni militum euasimus, qui lecta trecentorum manu inessum ab hostibus tumulum occupauit atque moratus hostes est, dum exercitus omnis euaderet. ac sic pulcherrimo exitu Thermopylarum et Leonidae famam adaequauit.' Ampel. 20 (qui pro p. R. salute se optulerunt) 5 'trecenti sub Calpurnio Flamma contra Poenos, qui in Siciliensi saltu morte sua exercitum p. R. liberauerunt, ut plane ccc Lacedaemoniorum apud Thermopylas gloriam adaequarent.' Liu. xxii 60 11 'si, ut nobis adulescentibus priore Punico bello Calpurnius Flamma trecentis uoluntariis, cum ad tumulum eos capiendum situm inter medios duceret hostes, dixit "moriatur, milites, et morte nostra eripiamus ex obsidione circumdatas legiones," si hoc P. Sempronius diceret, nec uiros equidem nec Romanos uos ducerem, si nemo tantae uirtutis exstitisset comes.'

Six words in the verse, and I have altered five of them; so willkürlich, so unmethodisch, so subjektiv-ästhetisch is my criticism.

370 *istarum piadasque* B, *Scipiadisque* V, *Scipiatosque* F. Editors fling *istarum* to the winds, adopt Bembus' arbitrary change of acc. to nom., and in 369 Heyne's *tales* for *talis*, and write the verses thus:

flammae  
(iure igitur tales sedes pietatis honores),  
Scipiadaeque duces, quorum cet.

This is no way to deal with a passage where the metre has a word too many and the syntax a word too few: far shrewder is Naeke, who says at Val. Cat. p. 293 'uersus excidit unus, cuius residuum in uoce *istarum* latet.' I believe that from this relic almost the very words of the author can be recovered:

iure igitur talis sedes pietatis honores  
i n s t a u r a t < pia sic meritis. te, Regule,  
cerno

Sci>piadasque duces, quorum cet.

The scribe glanced from the first to the second *pia. talis* is acc. plur., and *talis honores* refers to 358 sq. 'hic alii se dant pariles uirtutis honore | herces mediisque siti sunt sedibus': *sedes pia* occurs in 39 and 375, *pietatis honores* in 225, *instaurat*

*honores* in Verg. Aen. v 94, where however the verb has the special force of 'denuo instaurat.' The construction then is 'iure igitur (ob pietatem uersibus 361-8 significatam) sedes pia instaurat tales pietatis honores uiris tam bene meritis.'

371 *rapidis* B, *romanis* IV interpolate. The sense required was first pointed out by Naeke l.c. p. 294, who conjectured *harundinibus*; Haupt *uepretis*, which is what the poetaster ought to have written; Ribbeck *rapinis*, 'turnip fields', which perhaps he was not incapable of writing. That turnips were grown in the province of Africa appears from the fact that Vespasian was pelted with them at Hadrumetum in his proconsulship, Suet. Vesp. 4. Even closer to *rapidis* would be *rapicis*, 'turnip leaves', Plin. n.h. xviii 127, which of course has its antepenultimate short like *tribunicus*, though Georges marks both of them long. But bad as this poet indisputably is, these scribes are worse, and I suspect that they had more hand than he in sowing turnips on the site of Carthage.

401-403.

hic Cilici crocus editus aruo  
laurus item Phoebi decus surgens, hic rhododaphne  
liliaque.

In 1897, in the Journal of Philology vol. xxv p. 244, I wrote

I will take the opportunity of emending 402, which is usually reduced to metre by reading *surgens decus*, an arrangement the scribes were not likely to disturb. Write *decus ingens*: *ingens* becomes *urgens* (Stat. Theb. vi 827 *ingentibus* and *urgentibus* MSS), the s of *decus* adheres and makes *surgens* (Stat. Theb. i 357 *gelidas surgens* and *gelidas urgens* MSS).

For the rhythm see 381 'digredior numquam rediturus. tu cole fontes': so in 173 sq. I should punctuate 'aspectuque micat flammamarum) lumine toruo | metabat sese circum loca'.

Mr Vollmer in 1900, in the Rheinisches Museum vol. lv p. 521, writes

u. 402 legendum puto per oxymoron *laurus item Phoebi decus urgens*, nempe Daphne amore urget deum.

At me litterulas stulti docuere parentes.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

## A LATIN TRIBUTE FROM DEAN VINCENT TO WARREN HASTINGS.

In a copy of Dean Vincent's *Voyage of Nearchus*, translated (Oxford 1809) lately given to University College, Sheffield, by Professor J. E. B. Mayor of Cambridge, the appended verses by Vincent and his letter enclosing them are inserted.

The letter is addressed to Mr. James Boswell (1778-1822) second son of Johnson's biographer, a barrister at law and, as an old Westminster boy, probably a former pupil of Vincent's. The book itself no doubt belonged to Boswell, (it is a gift 'from the author') and no doubt it was he who pasted in it Vincent's verses on the eighty-fourth birthday of Warren Hastings.

These verses written by a famous scholar in honour of a great builder of the empire have no little interest at the present time.

The 'Impey' mentioned in the letter is not Sir Elijah Impey, Hastings' contemporary and schoolfellow, who had died in 1809, but one of his sons, probably Elijah Barwell Impey, who like his father and Hastings himself had been educated at Westminster. It is noteworthy that Gleig's *Memoirs of Warren Hastings* (vol. iii. p. 500), gives a letter from Hastings to Elijah Barwell Impey dated 'Daylesford House [Worcestershire] 19th Dec. 1816,' which begins 'Yesterday was my 84th birthday.' The day which Dean Vincent honoured by his verses was therefore the 18th December 1816.

The *Dictionary of National Biography* while stating that Warren Hastings was born in 1732 gives the date of his birth as the 6th December. If that is not an error, we must suppose that in his later years Hastings in commemorating his birthday took account of the change from Old to New Style.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

[ENCLOSING LETTER].

DEAR BOSWELL,

If you had not been in a hurry, you might have had the enclosed yesterday. I trust to your honour that it be not seen till the principal has got his copy: in that copy I have unfortunately written auspice where it ought to have been omine. Can Impey correct it?

Yours truly,  
W. V.

Dec. 16.

MR. BOSWELL,  
GARDEN COURT, TEMPLE.

GUARRENO HASTINGS, AET<sup>a</sup>. 84.

O decus imperii, cui Ganges paruit ingens,  
Cujusque auspiciis Belli flagrante procella,  
Res stetit Angligenum, fracti cessere

Marattae,—

Intima Mysoreus repetens sua regna  
Tyrannus

Delituit, versis doluitque inglorius armis.  
Nec tumidae valuereminae, nec Martius ardor  
Gallorum, insidiaeque Indos ad bella cientes.

Vivis adhuc, Venerande Senex, rurisque  
recessu

Contemplare tuo quae gesseris omine,—  
quosque

Tentandos aliis promoveris ante triumphos.

Namque per Oceanum qui lambit littora  
Sinae,

Et patet ad fines tellus ubi prominet Afra,  
Post acies terrâ, post classes aequore victas,  
Vexillum imperii jam sola Britannia pandit.

His fruere: at meritis si patria parca  
favorem

Abneget, et justae suspendat praemia  
laudis,—

Esto: sed egregias constanti in pectore vires,  
Justitiam, purasque manus, mentemque  
capacem

His saltem accumulem donis,—nec munera  
Musae

Respue, Pierias nam tu colis ipse sorores.

## REVIEWS.

TUCKER'S *CHOEPHORI* OF AESCHYLUS.

*The Choephoroi of Aeschylus* with Critical Notes, Commentary, Translation, and a Recension of the Scholia, by T. G. TUCKER Litt. D., Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Melbourne. Cam-

bridge, at the University Press. 1901.  
8vo. pp. civ, 318. 12s. 6d.

THIS edition, excellently printed, is arranged on the same plan as Sir Richard

Jebb's of Sophocles; it is dedicated to him, and has made good use of his admirable introduction to the *Electra*. Mr. Tucker's edition of the *Supplices* was ably reviewed in these columns by Prof. Housman,<sup>1</sup> and a great deal of that criticism is applicable still, but with a certain difference in detail. In 1084 lines of the *Supplices* Mr. Tucker introduced some 200 conjectures of his own, among which Mr. Housman considered 4 quite certain; I gladly adopted more like 12 in my prose version: but hardly one stone was left upon another, and many of them had hardly any relation to the MS. Mr. Tucker now claims it as a merit that his text is exceptionally conservative, faithful to the MS. Perhaps it may prove to be a merit; but there is much loose thinking and loose language on this point. If the MS. is good, it is a merit to maintain it; if the MS. is bad, it is a fault: to assume it as a merit without proving the correctness of the MS. is to beg the question. Mr. Tucker does not acknowledge any modification of his critical principles, merely holding that the *Supplices* was desperately corrupted, whereas the text of the *Choephoroi* is much sounder than is usually supposed. But the truth appears to be that in the interval he has come under the influence of Dr. Verrall, with whom he avows having found himself habitually in agreement. Now, Dr. Verrall's method is well-known: he treats almost every reading in any MS. he happens to be dealing with as true if only we knew how to interpret it; and having more faith in the elastic power of the Greek tongue, moves easily what we had thought were mountains. Mr. Tucker's belief in this elasticity is not so great, but it is a very different thing from what it was.

To my mind the most satisfactory part of the work is the translation. Prose can never represent such verse aesthetically, and ought frankly to be prose, content if it can explain without offence how the Greek is to be construed. If Mr. Tucker's renderings are often incorrect, they are nearly always good and vigorous English.

We are not likely, I think, to get much forwarder with Aeschylus without new illustration and more study of ideas. Verbal emendations we may make, and every true thing helps; but they do not greatly matter now unless they give us new significances, literary and artistic. I will take one passage to show doubly what I mean by an idea. The most familiar attributes of

Justice were her *balance* and her *all-regarding eye*: Δίκας ῥέπει τάλαντον Bacchyl. xvi. 25, *Agam.* 261; she was the personification of τὸ ἴσον, τὸ ἰσόρροπον, and the *incommensurable* iustitiae oculus (Amm. Marc. xxix. 2. 20), Δίκης ὀφθαλμός, πάνσκοπον ὄμμα Δίκης A.P. vii. 580, was an even commoner conception, so that an epithet applied to her, or to her servant Νέμεϊς, was ἐπίσκοπος, Plat. *Legg.* 717 D, 872 E, Periclyona Stob. *Flor.* 79. 50. When therefore in *Cho.* 59 we find ῥοπή δ' ἐπισκοπεῖ Δίκας<sup>2</sup> ταχέια τοὺς<sup>3</sup> μὲν ἐν φάει.... it is reasonable to see a combination of these two,—not a confusion, for ἐπισκοπή meant ἐκδίκησις. Now in our latest editors there is no dream of either; Dr. Verrall thinks 'the figure suggested is that of a bird of prey,' while in Prof. Tucker's interpretation neither ῥοπή nor ἐπισκοπεῖ are even attributes of Δίκη: he retains the corrupted text δίκαν and explains it 'The turn of events looks to justice.' Further, Plutarch *de sera numinis vindicta* 22 p. 564 E relates how a ψυχή informed Aridaeus in his vision that Adrasteia, daughter of Ἀνάγκη and Zeus, employs three ministers to deal with three classes of offenders, none of whom escape; the first are punished in their flesh at once (εὐθὺς ἐν σώματι, ἐν τῷ βίῳ) by Ποινὴ ταχέια, with treatment comparatively mild; the second who require more drastic remedies, are handed over by ὁ δαίμων<sup>4</sup> after death to Δίκη: while the utterly incurable, whom Δίκη quite rejects, are chased and worried by Erinyes, the most savage, till she has plunged them into utter darkness, ἡφάνισε καὶ κατέδυσε ἐς τὸ ἄρηγον καὶ ἄορατον. *Cho.* 59 is to this effect:

ῥοπή δ' ἐπισκοπεῖ Δίκας  
ταχέια τοὺς μὲν ἐν φάει,  
τὰ δ' ἐν μεταίχμιῳ σκότου  
μένει χρονίζοντι<sup>5</sup> βρῦναι,  
τοὺς δ' ἄκρατος<sup>6</sup> ἔχει νύξ.

'But the scale of Justice visiteth sinners either in the light of day, or else in twilight teems with wrath deferred, or else they are immersed in utter night.' The Twilight is the intermediate Purgatory between the light of life and the utter darkness of Hell: the longer punishment is deferred, the worse it grows, εἰ δὲ Δίκη σε παρπὸδα μὴ τιμωρὸς ἐτίσται, δις τόσον αἰθὺς ἔσσεται ἐν πλεόνεσσι παλίσκοτος: hence implacable enemies prayed that the

<sup>2</sup> The reading of the schol.

<sup>3</sup> Plat. *Phaedo* 107 D.

<sup>4</sup> M. Schmidt; χρονίζουσα (Schuetz) or χρονίζοντα come to the same thing.

<sup>5</sup> Schuetz for ἄκρατος.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted by Suid. s.v. παρπὸδα.

<sup>1</sup> C.R. 1890 p. 105.

wicked might continue in their wickedness, and this is what Ἄρη suffers them to do in 66 sqq. I cannot think that any one who will compare the language of Aeschylus and Plutarch will deny that the three classes are the same in both; and when those two are considered together with the numerous Platonic passages upon the subject, it is reasonable to refer them all to a common Orphic or Pythagorean source. But for anything of this kind we shall look in vain to Mr. Tucker: religious or philosophical ideas which meant so much to Aeschylus have little interest for him; he is more at home in discussing the ἀναγνώρισις from Aristotle's point of view. His version of *Cho.* 59 is:

ῥοπα δ' ἐπισκοπεῖ δίκαν  
ταχεία τοῖς μὲν ἐν φάει,  
τὰ δ' ἐν μεταχμίῳ σκότον  
μένει χρονίζοντα βάρει·  
τοὺς δ' ἀκραντος ἔχει νύξ.

which he explains to mean 'The fall of the scale looks to justice for its cue: where it sees clearly, the fall is swift; where it dimly discerns, it lingers ('βάρει i.e. in the falling scale'); where darkness quite conceals, it is baffled.' To say nothing of the Greek, the meaning, I submit, is ludicrous; the whole point is that Justice is never baffled, that the sinners never do escape; and indeed Mr. Tucker feels this should be so, but in his view it was superfluous to express it; you are to supply '(though the time of punishment will come after all)', and this rather important reservation, unexpressed, is to serve as a connection with the following sentence, 'the connection being "(punishment comes at last)", and'.—I quoted Plutarch's passage to explain the Aeschylean in the *Journal of Philology*, 1895, p. 313, but Mr. Tucker is not a reader of our English journals; my last paper in the *Classical Review* (May, 1900) was not available much more than a year before he dates his preface, and he is good enough to mention it with regret that it appeared too late for him to use; but other papers of mine he gives no sign of having seen.

He has made, however, excellent emendations in his time, and I should like to welcome two outside this play, προσέφατο in *Agam.* 770 and βάλλεται γὰρ ὅσοις Διὸς ἐν κάραν (for κερανός) in 476. In the *Chosph.* the following seem to me the best of the new readings: on 811 πολλὰ δ' ἄλλα φανεῖ χρηζῶν κρυπτά one schol., τὰ δὲ κρυπτά νῦν φανερώσει, is evidently written on φανεί or ἀμφανεί, but there is another, θέλων πολλὰ

κρυπτὰ εὑρίσκει, which T. points out is an explanation (it is the regular one) of ἀλφάνει. Which is genuine is another matter; either in itself might well be said of Hermes: here I am still inclined to think that ἀμφανεί is right, in opposition to the sentence following, especially since I suspect that ἐπιφορώτατος should be ἐπεὶ ταρώτατος.—70 πόροι τε πάντες ἐκ μιᾶς ὁδοῦ | <φοι>βαίνοντες τὸν | χερομυστῇ corresponding to αἰανὴς ἅτα | διαφέρει, the καθαίροντες which follows now in 72 being a gloss; it is the regular explanatory word, as in the Et. Mag. 797. 6 (for φοιβαίνω is not preserved by Hesychius alone) παρὰ τὸ φοιβάναι, τὸ καθάραι, ὡς τὸ 'φοιβανῶν δὲ τις ἀσάμινθον'. The passage is too much mutilated for one to feel sure of this conjecture, but it gains probability with me from having occurred to two minds independently, for I have made the same proposal.<sup>1</sup>—835 τὸν αἴτιον δ' ἐξαπώλλυε σπύρον 'utterly destroy the germ of guilt', for ἐξαπολλύσμερον, is the sort of sense I had been seeking, but I had thought of nothing better myself than ἐξαπώλλυ' ἡμερον.—692 καὶ νῦν Ὀρέστῃς—ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχων ἔξω νομίζων ὀλεθρίου πηλοῦ πόδα—'And now Orestes . . . for he was fancying (ἦν νομίζων) that he was shrewdly keeping his foot out of the mire', where the vulgate is ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχων ἔξω κομίζων (the schol.'s reading) . . . 'for he was in prudent case, in extricating his foot', as though it were εὐβουλος ἦν κομίζων . . . It is not easy to decide, but Mr. Tucker's view may very well be right.—196 ἀλλ' ἐν σαφ' ἦναι for εἶ.—415 θάρσσεα (plural of θάρσος) where Turnebus' θρασεία is not admitted by the metre.—926 πατὴρ γὰρ αἴσα τόνδ' ἐσονρίζει μόρον 'Thy father's fate wafts events to this slaying'.—611 ἄλλα δ' ἦν τι' ἐν λόγοις στυγεῖν, φονία σκύλαξ (a play on the name Κύλλα) for ἄλλα δὴ τι' . . . σκύλλαν is an ingenious notion, but will hardly be convincing until Mr. Tucker can produce a parallel to the expression ἦν τι' ἐν λόγοις στυγεῖν, which he explains 'and there was another for (= to help) men to utter abhorrence'.—1017 οὐτις . . . διὰ πάντ' <ἀγ>άτιμος ἀμείψει, μόχθος δ' ὁ μὲν αὐτίχ' ὁ δ' ἤξει: but μόχθος should be the antithesis to something like ἀνατος or ἀχειμος.—639 sqq. he interprets 'For unrighteousness doth not lie trodden under heel, and leave us to trespass with lawfulness on all that Zeus makes holy', reading τὸ πᾶν Διὸς σέβας παρεκβάντ' εἰς θεμίστως for παρεκβάντες οὐ θεμίστως (altered from ἀθεμίστως). Surely Aeschylus would have said Righteousness, not unrighteousness. But

<sup>1</sup> Camb. Univ. Reporter Dec. 4, 1900.



*παρεκβάντ'* I suspect is part of the truth; my notion was 'But the sword of Justice wounds him that transgresses, trampled under foot, the holiness of Zeus and turns aside unto unrighteousness', *λῆξ πέλοι πατούμενον τὸ πᾶν Διὸς σέβας παρεκβάντ' ἐς οὐ θεμιστά* (the last word having been supposed adverbial with *παρεκβάντες*, and glossed in the usual way by *ἀθεμίτως* or *οὐ θεμιστῶς*), like *A.P.* xvi. 243 *ἦν δὲ παρεκβαίης ἐς ἅ μὴ θέμις*.—In another place a conjecture of Mr. Tucker's helps, I think, towards the restoration of the true reading: 388 *τί γὰρ κεύθω φρέν', ὃ θεῖον ἔμπας ποτᾶται*; (for *φρενόςθεῖον*) 'Why hide the heaven-sent presage—for 'tis none else—that visits me?' For several reasons I cannot think this right; they don't say *κεύθειν φρένα* but *ἐνὶ φρεσὶ, μὴ κεύθει νόω, μὴ κεύθει' ἔνδον καρδίας*; if we had *φρενί*, I could understand the grammar of it; but I do not see the force of *θεῖον* here: the Chorus cannot hide their hatred, but how is it a presage, and why should they ascribe their feeling to the inspiration of divinity? I had been trying, on account of the figure, to read *σεῖον*, and had thought of *φρένα σεῖον*: but this did not account for *φρενός*, and there was nothing for the neuter participle to agree with: *ΦΡΕΝΟCEῖON* will account for everything; *τί γὰρ κεύθω φρέν' ὃ σεῖον ἔμπας ποτᾶται*; 'for how can I hide what still keeps quivering my breast?'—442 *κλύειν*.—577 *ἐξίν' οὖν*.—569–71 *εἰ δ' οὖν ἀμείψω . . .*,

*τάπερ ὁ Λοξίας ὁ Παρνάσιος  
μέγαν ἔχων μυχὸν χθονὸς ἔπωρθίαξ-  
εν ἀδόλως δόλι' ἐν χρόνους  
θεῖσ' ἄγαν ἐποιχεται.*

5 *κρατεῖ τᾷδε πως τὸ θεῖον, παραὶ τὸ μὴ*  
6 *ὑπουργεῖν κακὰ κακοῖς,*  
*ἴσον δ' οὐρανοῦχον ἀρχὰν σέβειν.*

In a piece of Paeonic and dochmiac 152—63 he introduces this, 157 *σέβας ὃ δέσποτα τᾶξ ἀμανρᾶς φρενός*, and alters the concluding line *σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα<sup>1</sup> νομῶν βέλη* (two dochmiacs) to *σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα νομῶν* 'which, besides making the best sense, is more rhythmical.' *σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα νομῶν* by itself is *epitrite*, which has no sort of relation to the rest. It is the same with a pair of epitrites introduced into cretic metre at 605 *πυρδαῖτιν<δὴ>πρόνοιαν*, where *δὴ* is 'demanded by the sense as well as by the metre.'

<sup>1</sup> This he explains in the old way, and accounts for *Κανθὰ βέλη* by the remark that 'the Scythian police (*τοξόται*) had been established at Athens from B.C. 480.' Possibly; but would Aeschylus make his Chorus cry for the police?

*ἦ καὶ μολὼν ἔπειτά μοι κατὰ στόμα*, 'But if I cross . . ., or should he afterwards come', would be better for a parallel to the construction and for some explanation of *ἐπειτα*.—So would 479 *χρεῖαν ἔχω φυγεῖν μέγαν παθεῖσαν Αἰγίσθω <ψόγον>* 'To escape the great reproach—"Sold to Aegisthus!"' an ingenious thought, but we have only his word as yet that 'the accus. is the proper exegesis of *ψόγον*, i.e. *φυγεῖν μέγαν ψόγον, ὅτι ἐπράθην*.'

New interpretations that seem most worth mentioning are 601 *ἴστω δ' ὅστις οὐχ ὑπό-τερος φροντίσιν* not 'flighty' here but 'fledged with thought', i.e. quick of wit.—587 *πεδαίχ-μοι λαμπάδες πεδάμαροι* not 'meteors' but 'lightning'.—154 *πρὸς ἔρμα τόδε κτε*.

Many of the conjectures are out of court, because they are not metrical. Greek lyric metre cannot be learnt without an ear to start from, and an ear for metre is a gift from God; but to lack it is a misfortune especially in dealing with so great a lyric poet. I know one serious student of Aeschylus who refrains entirely from the lyrics on this ground; that perhaps is over-diffident, but it would certainly be more agreeable to have the lyrics in all the corruption of the MS. than as Mr. Tucker gives them. In the *Supplices* his one study was to equalize the corresponding lines, and that is still the only condition he seems conscious of; even that is not always successfully achieved; 952 = 963

*τάχα δὲ παντελὴς χρόνος ἀμείψεται  
πρόθυρα δωμάτων ὅταν ἀφ' ἑστίας  
μύσος ἅπαν ἐλάσῃ καθαρ-  
μοῖς ἀρᾶν λυτήριον.*

5 *τύχαι δ' εὐπροσωποκοῖται τὸ πᾶν*  
6 *ιδεῖν ἀκούσαι τ' ἐρομένοισι  
μέτοικοι δόμων πεσοῦνται πάλιν.*

622 *πόνων, ἀκρῶσαι δεῖ δυσφιλὲς γαμή-  
= 630 λόγῳ, γοᾶται δ' ἀδήποθ' ἐν κατάπτ-  
815 καὶ τότ' ἤδη πῶν τὸν (or πλοῦτον)*

*δωμάτων λυτήριον*  
790 *ἴσθι δ' ἀνδρὸς φίλον πῶλον εὖ-  
νιν ζυγέιντ' ἐν ἄρματι  
πυμάτων ἐν οἱ δρόμῳ προστιθεῖς  
μέτρον τό τις ἂν σωζόμενον ρυθμὸν  
θεῖτ' ιδεῖν δι' ἀπεδὸν  
ἀνομέων βαριάτων ὄρεγμα,*

'And set thou before him such a measure to be run as one might shew a steady pace unbroken o'er the level,' which seems to me unintelligible in two languages, even with the explanation that the inserted *τὸ* in 793 '—δ' ('over which') the accus. of extent.' These will be enough to show what rhythm is



preserved in the sort of measure Mr. Tucker sets before us.

The method might with advantage have owed more to Prof. Jebb's example. Every one knows how carefully he deals with various opinions, and speaking for myself, it is very rarely that I do not acquiesce in his judicial summing-up. In Dr. Verrall and Prof. Tucker we have rather the special pleader than the judge; they seldom give us more than one side of the argument, and Mr. Tucker is very apt not to discuss or not to mention views that have been thought to have at least a reasonable case. For instance in 730 Αἰγίσθων ἡ κρατοῦσα τοὺς ξένους καλεῖν ἀνωγειν all critics except V. and T. now read τοῖς ξένους 'The mistress (*Trach.* 405) bids call Aegisthus for the guests' (Ar. *Av.* 80 τὸν δεσπότην ἡμῖν κάλεσον, *Lys.* 701 τοῖσι παισὶ τὴν ἐταῖραν ἐκάλεσα, 871 σὺ δ' ἐμὲ τοῦτω μὴ κάλει, Eur. *El.* 499, 789), and think τοὺς ξένους was an easy inadvertence for a scribe: neither V. nor T. quotes anything in favour of this reading, and T. ignores it, giving us his own conjecture ἡ κρατοῦσα τοῦ στόγους.—In 277 T. reads τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ γῆς δυσφρόνων μελίγματα βροτοῖς πιφαύσκων εἶπε τὰς γεννῶ νόσους: neither V. nor T. mentions Lobeck's μνηγματα which seems to me unquestionably right; T. does mention Hermann's τὰσδ' αἰνῶν νόσους, 'The correction is technically good, but the word αἰνῶν is unconvincing and the general sense unsatisfactory.' On what grounds? I still believe it to be true, and my ignorance is not enlightened.—In 1038 we get a natural sentence if with Blomfield we transpose two lines, καὶ μαρτυρεῖν μὲν ὡς (or πῶς) ἐπορσύνθη κακὰ | τὰδ' ἐν χρόνῳ μοι πάντας Ἀργείους λέγω· ἐγὼ δὲ... (μαρτυρεῖν μελέως MS): thus μὲν marks a contrast with ἐγὼ δέ, the pronoun, as T. observes, being antithetic to Ἀργείους. The antithesis however is with him no argument for μὲν, nor does he mention Blomfield's view, but reads τὰ δ' ἐν χρόνῳ μοι πάντας Ἀργείους λέγω καὶ μαρτυρεῖν μὴ νηλεῶς <πορεῖν μ' ὅσα ἐς τὴν τεκοῦσαν μέλει> ἐπορσύνθη κακὰ, 'And, as for that fell work

(τὰ δ'), let every Argive in time to come e'en bear me witness (καὶ μαρτυρεῖν) that I wrought it not ruthlessly.' And is that the defence which the witness of all Argos is to plead, 'He murdered his mother, it is true; but he was not ruthless'? Is not that rather in the style of Mr. Gilbert? Hitherto we have supposed with Cicero *de invent. rhet.* I. xii. 18 *Orestes, si accusetur matricidii, nisi hoc dicat 'Iure feci, illa enim patrem meum occiderat,' non habet defensionem.* The whole case turns on the question whether it was justifiable homicide, whether it was done δικάως, *Eum.* 471, 615, 618; that is the plea that he himself desires a witness for (*Cho.* 985), nor so long as he retains his senses (1024) does he dream of any other.

Much of the originality is now displayed in championing long-exploded readings: 14 ἡ πατρὶ τῷμῳ τὰσδ' ἐπικάσας τὶχος χοῶς φερούσας νεπτέροις μελίγμασιν; was corrected by Casaubon to μελίγματα, as *Pers.* 613 χοῶς φέρονσ', ἅπερ νεκροῖσι μελικτήρια. Dr. Verrall maintains the MS. text, as meaning 'Shall I liken the bringing of offerings by these women to a subsequent (νεπτέροις) propitiation of my father?' while Mr. Tucker takes νεπτέροις μελίγμασιν in apposition to πατρὶ τῷμῳ, the plural implying 'one who is wont to be appeased.'—The corrected reading of 32 is τορὸς γὰρ ὀρθόθριξ φόβος δόμων ὀνειρόμαντις (ὁ σαφὴς φόβος δι' ὀνείρων μαντευόμενος schol.), to which Orestes refers in 928 ἡ κάρτα μάντις οὐδ' ὀνειράτων φόβος. Since the terms describing this dream-terror are throughout the terms applied to prophecy, φοῖβος was an easy error for a scribe; Dr. Verrall keeps his version, τορὸς γὰρ Φοῖβος ὀρθόθριξ, but Mr. Tucker avoids the false quantity by reading τορὸς γε Φοῖβος ὀρθόθριξ (which would mean 'Phoebus was clear!'): Φοῖβος they hold stands for 'an inspiring power', 'divining spirit,' which it never does, and the word would be particularly inappropriate here, since terrifying dreams did not come from Phoebus but from his very opposite, the powers of Earth and Darkness. In 42 most people read with Elmsley

τοιάνδε<sup>1</sup> χάριν | ἀχάριτον | ἀπότροπον κακῶν  
= 53 σέβας δ' ἄμαχον | ἀδάματον | ἀπόλεμον τὸ πρὶν

as *Phoen.* 1757 χάριν ἀχάριτον ἐς θεοὺς διδοῦσα. Mr. Tucker, prudently omitting this illustration which other commentators quote, says 'The reading ἀχάριτον is unhappy, weakening a form of antithesis much affected by the Greeks,' and inserts with Hartung δὲ after τοιάνδε, which is not in accordance

with Greek usage. Dr. Verrall scans ἀπότροπον, 'but it is altogether more probable,' says T., 'that ἀπότροπον exactly answers metrically to ἀπόλεμον.' Yet that is precisely the ground on which Elmsley's ἀχάριτον has been generally approved.—In 69 οἴγοντι δ' οὔτι νυμφικῶν ἰδωλίων ἄκος, the correction of Stephanus and Scaliger, *θειόντι*, is accepted by every one except V. and T. It is a

<sup>1</sup> I think with Schuetz it ought to be τοιάνδε.

technical word in this connexion and has every other argument in its favour, the schol. (τῷ ἐπιβάντι νυμφικῆς κλίνης), the rhythm, the tense, and the construction; but 'θιγόντι,' says V., 'could scarcely be accepted even if it were given by the MS.'; T. follows; 'it is unsuited to ἰδωλίων'—as though ἄθικτος were not used in prose and verse alike of inviolable places—and reduces the contents of the expression.—In 404 other critics adopt the correction of Bamberger and Paley ποῖοι δᾶ, νεπτέρων τυραννίδες (or ποιοῖ δᾶ), the same exclamation that Cassandra uses; V., keeping the MS. ποῖ ποῖ<sup>1</sup> δῆ, translates it 'How long then?'; T. 'Of what avail are . . .?' But ποῖ δῆ; means 'Where are you going?' ὦ φίλε Φαίδρε, ποῖ δῆ καὶ πόθεν; T. has curious notions of its meaning: 881 ποῖ Κλυταμνήστρα; 'Where has Clytemnestra gone to?' (as Ar. Eccl. 311) he translates 'What keepeth Clytemnestra?' and 728 ποῖ δῆ πατεῖς . . . πύλας; 'How comest thou to set foot in the gates?' That would be πῶς in Greek, not ποῖ.—In 534 ἀνήλθον ἐκτυφλωθέντες σκότῳ λαμπτήρες other critics read ἀνήθον with the confirmation of the schol. ἀνέλαμψαν (αἰθῶ being regularly explained by λάμπω): no aorist-form of αἰθῶ was in use, but we have the imperfect in *Ajax* 286 λαμπτήρες οὐκέτ' ἦθον where also there is a *v.l.* ἦλθον. V. boldly says 'ἀνέλαμψαν was not written upon ἀνήθον,' and tells us that ἀνήθον means 'recovered their health,' an intransitive verb from the same root as ἀλθαίνω: T. thinks that lamps 'came up' like the sun from beneath the earth.—551 τοῖς δ' ἐν τι ποιεῖν τοὺς δὲ μὴ τι δρᾶν λέγων MS. and V., τοῖς δ' ἐν τι T.; τοῖς μὲν τι Stanley.—711 αἰὼν δὲ πράσσειν ὡς ὑπευθύνῳ τᾷδε Turnebus; scholl. ὑποδίκω and ὡς δώσονται δίκην (δίκας ὀφείλων schol. *Pers.* 213): ὡς ἐπευθύνῳ cod. M. and V., ὡς ἐπ' εὐθύνῳ T. (as cod. Guelf., which has the gloss ὑποδίκω).—738 ἡ δῆ κλύων ἐκείνος εὐφρανεῖ νόον, εὐτ' ἂν πύθεται μῦθον Robortelli; ἐκείνον MS., 'that cruel mind of his' T.; ἐκείνον i.e. τὸν μῦθον V.—841 ἄχθος αἰματοσταγῆς Portus; δειματοσταγῆς (ΔΙΜ for ΑΙΜ) MS., 'a drop-weight formidable to the old sore' V., 'a burden dripping with dread' T.—242 πιστὸς δ' ἀδελφὸς ἦσθ' ἐμοὶ σέβας φέρων μόνος κράτος τε καὶ δίκη . . . συγγενοῖτό μοι V. and T. with the MS.: 'τε and so, not to be joined with καὶ' V., but T. holds that 'The asyndeton and abrupt prayer impart a dramatic touch which is ruined by the prosaic conjecture

μόνον.'—451 τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ὄργα μαθεῖν 'one bout hath ended thus: be stubborn to try the next.' ὄργα<sup>2</sup> does not mean 'be stubborn' (τόλμα, τλήθι, καρτέραι); it means 'be passionately desirous'; but little words that won't mean what they ought to mean must be made to mean it.—In 882 εἴκοι νῦν αὐτῆς ἐπὶ ξυροῦ πέλας αὐχλὴν πεσεῖσθαι πρὸς δίκην πεπληγμένος, if ἐπὶ ξυροῦ were genuine, we should have to understand εἶναι with εἴκοι and take the future πεσεῖσθαι as depending on ἐπὶ ξυροῦ (εἶναι): but the conjecture of Abresch, ἐπιξήνου πέλας, allows πεσεῖσθαι to depend on εἴκοι and makes everything quite plain. Mr. Tucker does not discuss this or any other conjecture, but from the MS. text obtains this meaning, 'Her own neck now, nigh to the razor's edge, bids fair to fall by rights beneath its stroke.' Let Mr. Tucker try to strike any one's head off with a razor; he has more patience than I credit him with if he does not presently substitute an axe.

This ἐπιξήνου has been one of the small arguments in favour of the view that an axe was Clytemnestra's weapon. I am inclined to think that Aeschylus left it purposely to the imagination, and that elsewhere he has intentionally left external details vague; but Mr. Tucker, p. 263-6, differing from the opinion held by the late Mr. G. C. Warr,<sup>3</sup> is positive that she used nothing but a sword. It may be so; but his evidence is only partial, and not always soundly treated; with regard to ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμῳ for example in *Ag.* 1497 he argues that 'the insistence on the "double edge" agrees better with the notion of a thrusting sword. As applied to an axe the adjective would be otiose, since she could not turn the weapon round.' It would at least be no more otiose than in the many places where ἀμφιτομος and similar epithets describe an axe (βουπλήξ, πέλεκυς, βίρεννις).

His fidelity to the MS. is by no means proof, however, against over 60 conjectures of his own, some of which seduce him rather easily. In 1019 he rejects the correction ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν εἰδῇτ'—οὐ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅπῃ τελεί, in favour of ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν εἰδῇτ', οὐ τὰδ' οἶδ' ὅπῃ τελεί ὥσπερ σὺν ἵπποις ἡνιοστρόφον δρόμον (sic) telling us that this accounts better for the MS. εἰ δῆ τοῦτ' ἄρ . . . In 805 sense and metre<sup>4</sup> are restored by reading καὶ νιν ἐλευθερίως | λαμπρὸν ἰδεῖν φίλοις | ὄμμασι <ν

<sup>2</sup> τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ὄργαι M, but altered from αὐτοῖς: I still think it should be τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ὄργα μαθεῖν.

<sup>3</sup> C.R. 1898 p. 348.

<sup>4</sup> The same consecution as in *Supp.* 857-9=867-9, *Ag.* 993-5=1007-9.

<sup>1</sup> The corruption is of a common type, as παῖ παῖ for παπαῖ in Eur. *Alc.* 226.

ἐκ>δνοφερᾶς καλύπτρας: but neither V. nor T. will have anything to say to this insertion; V. renders *ἐλευθερίως*—*λαμπρὸν*—*καλύπτρας* 'bright with liberation from the gloomy veil,' while T., retaining *λαμπρῶς*, holds that 'We can hardly retain ὄμμασι,' and so reads *οἴγμασι*, 'look brightly forth through kindly openings of the murky veil.' He had made the same alteration before in *Ag.* 525, ἡ πον, πύλαι, φαιδροῖσι τοισδ' οἴγμασι or τοῖς διοίγμασι δέξεσθε, 'with your openings bright and cheerful'; the image apparently being such a smile as parts the face of Sir John Tenniel's Cheshire Cat.

For illustration he has put together what was collected by Blomfield, Paley, and others, and arrays it more agreeably in a literary dress. This is all to the good; but as in the *Supplices*, he contributes hardly any new, and is often at a loss where it was most required for language: e.g. for the use of *πρὸς* τὸ with infin. in 416 *πρὸς τὸ φανίσαι καλῶς*: for ἡ πῶς; in 763 'doubtless a conversational idiom'; *doubtful*, surely, until something like it can be found. 750 *πρόπως φρονός* 'as well as we know how', 'in the style of one's judgement': this is also contrary to the order of the words, and so is 469 <οὐ>δῶμασιν ἔμμοτον τῶνδ' ἐκάς 'Except this way' (what way?) 'the house can find no stanching of its wound': that would be οὐ τῶνδ' ἄτερ ἔμμοτον δῶμασιν. He does not indeed insist quite so habitually as Dr. Verrall upon stressing the last word of a clause (the usual result of which is to italicise the least emphatic word), but he asserts it often. Greek is the opposite of English in this matter, and one of the consequences is that Greek can have a pause after an unemphatic word at the beginning of a verse, while English cannot.

In default of parallels Mr. Tucker seems to think—and I mention it because it is the way that schoolboys now are taught to think—that a construction is canonised when it has been labelled with a grammatical appellation. 724 should be, I think, *τοῖσδ' ἐφορεῦσαι* *ξιφοδηλήτοις* *ἀγῶσιν* 'to act as ἔφορος or ἐπόπτης (technical in this connexion, Poll. iii. 140) at this contest of the sword', exactly like the synonymous *ἐποπτεῦσαι* in 581 and 487. Mr. Tucker does not mention this reading of Heyse's, but understands the MS. *ἐφοδεῦσαι* (a purely prose word) to mean 'see to the watch on behalf of these encounters'. 'The dative is of behalf' is a formula which serves him to explain that difficult passage 319 *χάριτες δ' ὁμοίως κέκληνται γῶς εὐκλείης προσδοκόμοις* 'Ατρεΐδαις, which he renders 'When Atridae stand before thy doors, is a lament of laud and honour still counted to

them for a deed of grace?' If doubts arise whether *τοῦτο χάρις κέκληται αὐτοῖς* could mean this, Mr. Tucker expects to quiet them by saying 'The dat. is of behalf: "Is it reckoned unto them?"' Again, in 565 the MS. gives us *μενούμεν οὕτως ὥστ' ἐπεικάζειν τινὰ δόμοις παρασείχοντα καὶ τὰδ' ἐνέπειν*. Boissonade and Hermann reasonably thought it should be *δόμοις*, but Dr. Verrall takes *δόμοις* with *ἐπεικάζειν* 'conjecture at the house', and Mr. Tucker follows: 'δόμοις: dat. incomm. with ἐπεικάζειν directly, and indirectly with ἐπεικάζειν καὶ τὰδ' ἐνέπειν', translating it 'may make surmise and chide the house'.

So far as I see, there is no solecism which could not be defended on this plan; for example, *τύπτω σοι* I beat you, '*dativus incommodi*'. But if a pupil were to offer that to Mr. Tucker, I believe—at least I hope—he would object. And why? Because the Greeks themselves happened always to say *τύπτω σε*. Exactly; the appeal would be at once to usage; did they speak this way or not?

He prints the Scholia at the end with notes, and has made a careful study of them which I am glad has not been fruitless; I have mentioned his recovery of a *v.l.* *ἀλφάνει* in 811. The note on *μοι* in 985 he refers to 975, reading *ξυνώμοσάν μοι θάνατον ἀθλίως πατρί*. I looked for some solution of 324 *ἡ γνάθος συνήθης, ὡς ὁ κρημνὸς λέγει Πίνδαρος καὶ ἡ ἥχω* *Ῥιμωνίδης*, but only find that it 'appears to be a note on genders'; I suspect it means 'as "the Rugged" says and "the Melodious."' T. suggests *γναθμός* in the text. 842 *οὐ παρακαλυφθέντι ἄλλ' ἀεμνήστω*, which T. (p. xcvi) refers to *ἐλκαίνοντι*, was surely written on a *v.l.* *δεδαυμένω* (Abresch). 445 *ἄφερκτος* *κατάκλειστος* *περὶ τὴν εἰρκτὴν* he thinks points to the locative *μνχοῦ*, as though you could be shut up round about a prison; Abresch corrected it to *κατάκλειστος*, *παρὰ τὴν εἰρκτὴν*. The value of scholia lies in their application, and here I cannot think that Mr. Tucker shows much tact: he has himself recovered from the scholia the reading *ἀλφάνει* and readily adopts it; but readings which other people have seen to be indicated by the scholia do not fare so fortunately (32, 59, 69, 250, 534, 645, 703, 711, 879). In 542 *οὐφάεισάσα* *σπαργανπλείζω*, like Conington and Paley, he observes the schol. *ἐπιμελείας ἤξιοτον*, and disregards it, because 'not much can be made of it,' reading *οὐφίς*, *ἃ παῖς ἄν, σπάργαν* 'ἡμφωπλίζω, a picture rather of an embolstered Tweedledee than of a swaddled infant. His suggestions that the schol. on 350 may

have used the word *τηλωπόν*, and that *κτείνει* in 440 may have arisen from *θείναι* glossing *κτείνει* show that the dialect of scholia is still as much to learn as when he held that *μαινόλιν* and *ἀχέων* were glosses in the *Supplices*.

Elsewhere he appears too little sensitive to the difference between verse and prose; in 954 reading *ἐν χρόνους θέϊσα* to mean *χρόνους ἐμπούσασα*, and in 687 suggesting *κατ' ἄκρας ἐνστάσεως πορθοῦμεθα*, a prose word in a novel sense, 'our last place of resistance'; printing however *εἶπας ὡς πορθοῦμεθα* which would mean 'you have stated that we are destroyed,' but in the sense 'your tale imports our ruin' is a usage I had pointed out has no support in Greek.<sup>1</sup> In 914 *διχῶς ἐπράβην ὦν ἐλευθέρου πατρός* he does not indeed, like Dr. Verrall, translate it as though it were *διπλῶς*, but *διχῶς* is a purely prose word of the prosiest, most common in the language of grammar-

<sup>1</sup> The true reading, strange as it may look, I now believe to be M. Schmidt's *ηγλεῶς*.

ians, *διχῶς*, *ἐξαχῶς*, *πολλαχῶς*, *λέγεται*, 'the word is used in 2, 6, many different senses;' and so far from Bothe's *αἰκῶς* being 'feeble' (V.), it seems to me to mark the point:—to be sold would be *οἰδὲν αἰκῆς* for the slave-born; for the son of a free father it was *αἰκία*, a foul outrage.

While thinking, then, that in these 400 pages the professional scholar will not fail to find some gain, I also think that for a pupil there is a far larger balance of Aeschylus in the editions of Paley and Mr. Sidgwick, because for any step that Mr. Tucker has made forward he perversely makes so many backward. I do not think this work is worthy of him: perhaps too much Aristotle has allowed his natural instinct for the language to grow blunter; otherwise I cannot help feeling he must often do it violence. If he would foster it and give it freer play, I think he would do greater justice to his capabilities.

W. HEADLAM.

#### RECENT EDITIONS OF PLAYS OF ARISTOPHANES

1. *The Knights of Aristophanes*. Edited by R. A. NEIL. Cambridge, 1901. Pp. xiv. 229. 10s.
2. *Aristophanis Equites*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. VAN LEEUWEN, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCC. Pp. xviii. 246. 6 M.
3. *Aristophanis Acharnenses*. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. VAN LEEUWEN, J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, MDCCCXI. Pp. xviii. 198. 5 M.
4. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*. Edited, translated, and explained by B. B. ROGERS. ix. *The Frogs*, x. *The Ecclesiazusae*. London: Bell & Sons. 1902. Pp. xlviii. 274 and xxxv. 238. Price 15s.

IN R. A. Neil Cambridge lost a true scholar. His premature death is also a real loss to the study of Aristophanes, for the book before us shows that he was in many ways admirably qualified for the work of a commentator on that fascinating but far from easy author. I should judge that Neil was not greatly interested in textual questions, for he dwells little on them and makes (I think), no valuable suggestion. Nor does his strength show itself in solving the riddle of very difficult passages and find-

ing a key to anything that has long been a mystery. It is to be found rather in two things. One is the care and the width of reading which he brings to bear on every ordinary point as it arises, calling the reader's attention to very many things that would probably escape him, and furnishing a neat and often convincing commentary on many little Aristophanic touches and matters of Attic life. The other is the nicety with which he often points out to us the proper sense, the special literary uses of individual words, helping us very greatly to take in their exact power and associations, a matter of extreme importance in the art of Aristophanes. A scholar of much ability and taste, with unusually wide interests and reading, who had for many years delighted in Attic comedy, sparing no pains in its study, and especially in the study of the *Knights*—this is the impression we carry away; and we regret that the knowledge and tact patiently acquired will not now be available for other plays.

Mr. Neil's death left his interesting Introduction apparently but half written, for about the *Knights* itself there is in it practically nothing. The notes however were virtually complete, and his two friends



(W. S. H. and L. W., Pembroke College, Cambridge), have had no occasion to add to them. If I miss anything in them, it is fuller statement and discussion of alternative readings and explanations. Mr. Neil is rather apt to limit himself too much to one view. An interesting feature of them is the occasional quotation of Shilleto's *adversaria*, hitherto as far as I know unpublished. It suggests the question whether, considering the great eminence of Shilleto as a scholar, some selection of notes from his own or his pupils' memoranda might not be made with gain and credit to English learning. It was implied above that the book offers few distinct novelties in text or interpretation, its characteristics being rather sobriety and thoroughness. I cannot say that the adoption of W. G. Clark's *ἑπερέτας* for *βέρας* in 32, ascribed to 'nervousness and chattering of teeth' commends itself to me very much, nor in 21 Dr. Verrall's explanation of ὡδι ξυλλαβών, 'taking it' (the word μόλωμεν), 'as I do,' i.e. pronouncing not μόλωμεν but μολῶμεν, in anticipation of αὐτομολῶμεν which is coming. For one thing this seems to disregard *ἐνεχέας*, of which the note offers no explanation at all. It is surely too much to suppose that in 203 ὁ Παφλαγὼν οὐτοσὶ means the real Cleon 'visible inside the house from the stage.' Again is Neil right in accepting the statement of lines 230-232 that Paphlagon (I am glad he calls him Paphlagon throughout), will not appear in a portrait-mask? This is the simple faith of most editors, but we are not always to take the comic poet at his word. I have always thought the exact opposite quite possible, as Mr. Van Leeuwen now points out that it is, namely that Paphlagon was one of the most speaking likenesses ever seen in the theatre of Dionysus. It is odd that, in mentioning here the old story that Aristophanes himself acted the part, Mr. Neil does not point out how the story is thought very plausibly to have arisen from the true statement that he brought out the play καθ' ἑαυτὸν, in his own name. His explanation by the bye of this phrase where it occurs in 506, *περιβέντες καθ' ἑαυτοὺς* is not more satisfactory than previous attempts to deal with it.<sup>1</sup>

In his note on *κωμωδοδιάσκalos* and *ποιη*

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Verrall's junction of καθ' ἑαυτοὺς with τοῖς ἀναπαίστοις, anapaests appearing in their own, i.e. the poet's own, name (this *Review* 16. 8) seems not only very forced but, as requiring <τοῖς> καθ' ἑαυτοὺς, impossible. Προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν τοῖς ἀναπαίστοις καθ' ἑαυτοὺς could surely mean nothing but 'attend to the parabasis in itself' i.e. think of nothing but the actual parabasis.

τῆς (507. 509) Neil misapprehends the words of Aristotle, οἱ λεγόμενοι αὐτῆς (i.e. τῆς κωμωδίας) ποιηταί, which imply no question whether comedy-writers are ποιηταί, but mean only *its list of poets*. In 536 he not only prefers παρὰ τῷ Διονύσῳ to παρὰ τῷ Διονύσῳ, but fails to give the explanation of the latter, which is the reading of all MSS., as meaning Dionysus' image placed in the theatre for the occasion. Is there not something in Blaydes' doubt whether the former reading would not at least require τῷ <τοῦ> Διονύσου? Are the editors, including Mr. Neil, justified in regarding the narrative (624-682) in which Agoracritus recounts the proceedings in the senate as burlesquing a tragic rhesis? If it were so, tragic rhythm would predominate throughout, and there would also be much mock-heroic language. In reality there is very little of either, and the speech does not to me suggest the narratives of tragedy at all, any more than (say) *Wasps* 85-135. It is only a lively story with a burlesque touch here and there. In 1130 ἄρας ἐπάταξα the general sense points clearly to making ἄρας mean 'raising my hand,' not 'hoisting him for a whipping. Why should Demos whip a προστάτης when gorged? He fells and despoils him. The note on 1112 brings δεδίασι κ.τ.λ. into relation with what Pericles and Cleon in Thucydides say (I would rather put it 'are made by Thucydides to say') about Athens being a τυραννίς. This ignores the distinction that in Thucydides the speakers are referring to the Athenian empire, while here it is mainly, if not exclusively, domestic dealings that are meant, as τὸν λέγοντα and other things show. πάντες ἄνθρωποι is hardly more than all Athenians.

It should be added that there are three excellent *excursus* at the end of the book; one a minute and instructive dissertation on the uses of γε: one on 'the political use of moral terms' (καλὸς κἀγαθός, ἀσφάλεια, σωφροσύνη, εὐνομία, ποιηρός and one or two more); and a third on tragic rhythm in comedy, which will make most readers of Aristophanes much more observant, if they bear it in mind.

Professor Van Leeuwen's two plays belong to the series in which he has already published *Clouds Wasps and Frogs*, and in which it is to be hoped that he will see his way to editing a complete Aristophanes. The *Acharnians* is an enlarged and Latinised revival of a small but useful edition with Dutch notes published in 1885. Both



volumes contain careful and very capable work. The critical part is better done than Mr. Neil's; the commentary contains less, though in its way excellent. The editor's mind is more open to novelties, and occasionally perhaps he is tempted into conjectures which are far from convincing. A few of the new suggestions may be set down here:

*Ach.* 46 οὐκ ἄρ' ἄστος for οὐκ ἄνθρωπος: 446 εἰ σοὶ μὲν εἴη for εὐδαιμονοίης: 504 καὶ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ ἐστὶ νῦν for οὐπὶ Ληναίῳ τ' ἀγών: 717 σφαλῆ for φύγη: 1064 ποιητέ' ἐστὶ for ποιεῖτε τοῦτο: 1082 Γηρυνὴν τετράπτε for Γηρυνὴν τετραπτεῖα: *Eq.* 220 χρόνοι τε συμβαίνουσι κατὰ τὸ Πυθικόν for χρησμοὶ τε συμβαίνουσι κατὰ τὸ Πυθικόν: 325 τῆς Πυκνός for τῶν ῥητόρων *metri causa*: 555 ποντοπόροι for μισθοφόροι: 707 ἐπὶ τῷ μάλισθ' ἦδουτ' ἂν for ἐπὶ τῷ φάγους ἦδιστ' ἂν. One or two of these, e.g. the last in *Ach.*, are attractive, but most of them have no probability. In *Ach.* 541 I rather wonder that Mr. Van Leeuwen has abandoned the very plausible εἰσπλεύσαν (for ἐκπλεύσας) which appeared in his Dutch edition and has been conjectured independently by Dr. Blaydes. Keeping τις ἐκπλεύσας σκάφει, which he regards as a quotation from Euripides, he now reads χῆν' ἥ for φήνας and suggests ὑφέλετο for ἀπέδοτο. It may be worth noting that he and Mr. Neil are agreed in thinking, as against the usual view, that at the end of the *Knights* there is nothing lost.

Mr. Van Leeuwen, like Mr. Neil, pays marked attention to Aristophanes' diction, and often calls our attention to a tragic or elevated expression which indicates parody, burlesque, or some other special purpose in the writer's mind. A novelty in notes is the division of them into three series or tiers, critical notes below the text, commentary below the critical notes, and below the commentary notes (mainly references) on the commentary itself. I am not sure that this refinement is to be commended. The volumes are admirably printed and most handsome in appearance, but so badly sewn that they split into fragments long before the reader has done with them.

All lovers of Aristophanes will welcome the appearance after a long interval of another volume from Mr. Rogers, containing this time two plays with commentary, copious critical notes, and, best of all, some more of his excellent verse translation: and our pleasure is increased when we learn that there is now every likelihood of his doing in this way the whole of the eleven plays. In

the present volume, as it happens, we have together what some will think the best and the weakest of the eleven. Certainly nothing of Aristophanes gives more pleasure than the *Frogs*. Whether the *Ecclesiazusae* falls below the *Peace* and the *Plutus* in comic force may be disputed, but the later part of it is at any rate somewhat repulsive reading. In dealing with this and other things in the plays Mr. Rogers has steered a judicious course, intermediate between offensive frankness and excessive delicacy. No one would wish that Aristophanes should be put into English verse just as he stands.

Mr. Rogers, like his original, is always at his best in the long lines, especially the long rolling anapaestic tetrameters; and this makes us regret, what he himself half apologises for, that he has not rendered into this sort of metre the corresponding parts of the *Ecclesiazusae*. Praxagora's communistic scheme would have gained a good deal in vigour and conviction by the change. On the other hand the famous passage of the *Frogs* in which Aeschylus sets forth his theory of tragic art is very well rendered, though I confess to thinking that certain passages of the *Wasps* are at present the high-water mark of Mr. Rogers' work.

Those who care less about the regular scholastic editions will find a good deal that is interesting, instructive, and judicious in the commentary. Mr. Rogers' judgment is always shrewd, and he has not read the poet all his life for nothing. In the *Frogs* for instance what he has to say about μακάρον εὐωχίαν (85) and the καινὸν χρυσίον (720), and at *Ecl.* 38 and elsewhere about the distribution of the women between stage and orchestra, &c., is very well worth attention. His argument that ἐκείνος in *Frogs* 790 (κάκεινος ὑπεχώρησε κ.τ.λ.) is Sophocles and his interpretation of περὶ τῶν κρεῶν (191) seem to me more disputable. In *Ecl.* 1090 again does not the point of the passage disappear, if διαλελημένον only means 'in someone's grasp'? One person can διαλαμβάνειν another (*Knights* 262); whereas here the very point is that there are two. But both passages are difficult. He is certainly wrong in saying that ἀγαθὸς ποιητής (*Frogs* 84) cannot mean 'a good poet.'

Mr. Rogers, though as a rule very conservative, suggests a few alterations of the text. In the *Frogs* besides περιπατεῖν in 953 and μελοφορεῖ in 1301 (both of which I may perhaps say have occurred to me too) he suggests in 647 ἔπτακον (improbable, as

being poetical) and in 1028 τὸν θρήνον ἀκούσας : in *Eccl.* 603 κἄν...ψευδορκήσῃ ; 643 τὸν ἐκείνου : 802 ἦν δὲ κωλύσῃσι.

In the introduction to the *Eccl.* will be found an interesting argument to show that women were not present at comedies in

Aristophanes' time, and in that to the *Frogs* an able examination of the points which each of the two contending poets makes against the metres of his rival. The examination of 1261 to 1295 is particularly good.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### LODGE'S LEXICON PLAUTINUM I.

*Lexicon Plautinum*, conscripsit GONZALEZ LODGE. Vol. I, fasc. I, A—ALIVS (Leipzig, Teubner, 1900). M. 7. 20.

THE appearance during the last two years of the first fascicles of two Plautine Lexica<sup>1</sup> indicates the progress of Plautine studies. Hitherto we have had to content ourselves with the *Lexica Plautina* of Pareus, published in 1634, and of Weise (Second Edition, 1886), both of which works, however useful in their own ways, are quite out of touch with modern criticism of the text. Nor was it possible before the publication of the *editio minor* of the text by Goetz and Schoell, which was commenced in 1893, to approach the task of writing an up to date lexicon of Plautus with any hope of success. The late Mr. J. H. Onions of Christ Church laid his hand to a Plautine lexicon in the early eighties, if I remember rightly ; but he found the ground on which he had to work too insecure to proceed. Now the situation is changed, and we may hope to possess in the course of a few years not one but two lexica based on the results of modern Plautine scholarship. Not that the task is by any means an easy one even now. The text of Goetz and Schoell leaves countless passages unemended, and the writer of a lexicon has necessarily to rely largely upon the work of other editors, such as Leo. But it is, I believe, generally felt by Plautine scholars that the publication of a lexicon on the basis of the results hitherto attained will prove to be itself the best means of securing further progress in the future.

The work of Professor Lodge will therefore be welcomed by all editors and students of the text of Plautus. It is executed on scientific principles, and it must

have involved an amount of patient labour from which most scholars would shrink and for which they will be proportionately grateful to the author.

The method of basing such a work on the text of Goetz and Schoell alone was a weakness of the first fascicle of Professor Waltzing's lexicon, as he himself recognized in his Preface—a weakness which he apparently intends to remove. Professor Lodge has wisely decided to take account of all the chief editions of the present day. In another point, too, he has improved upon the work of his immediate predecessor ; by means of a judicious economy of space he has kept down the size of his book as compared with Waltzing's, though it might have been still further reduced. Thus whereas Waltzing took up 151 pp. to cover the ground from *a* to *adeo*, Lodge gets this into about 46 pp. ; on the other hand it must be remembered that Lodge's pages are larger and have somewhat smaller print (not too small however).

The strong and the weak points of such a work as this can be fully appreciated only after using it for a considerable time. But I will indicate a few points in the first fascicle which have struck me as open to improvement, though nothing would be more unfair than to expect in a book of this kind absolute immunity from error, and most of the defects which I have to point out will not seriously diminish its utility to students who understand how to use it aright. In the first place I am doubtful whether some of the matter might not have been abbreviated with advantage. For instance the heading III on p. 41 might have been greatly reduced by omissions : was it necessary to enumerate all the passages in which we find together with *ad* and the accusative another preposition with its case, etc. ? If this were to be done with every preposition (e.g. *ab*) it would swell

<sup>1</sup> The work under consideration and the *Lexique de Plaute* edited under the direction of Professor Waltzing of Liège (1900).

the book considerably and perhaps unnecessarily. Secondly I think that too much consideration is shown to conjectures which have had their day, and some of which ought to be buried and forgotten as soon as possible: e.g. on p. 9 under *abaeto* we find Schoell's baseless reading in Rud. 1243 solemnly quoted twice; on p. 42, under *adbito*, his reading in Rud. 309; on p. 7 his reading in Cas. 935 (*ab ea*); on p. 13 Goetz' *picra's tu* in Mil. 438 (cf. under *ἀδικος*, p. 48). On the other hand readings are sometimes marked as conjectures which are not such; e.g. on p. 39 *ad recuperatores*, Rud. 1282 (see CD), on p. 40 *ad uelitationem*, Rud. 525 (see A). I have a further bone to pick with Prof. Lodge about *abaeto*: why this spelling (inconsistent with *adbito* and not supported by any of the MSS., except in one passage, Truc. 96, where B has the doubtful reading *abaetat*)! As for *abetis*, Bacch. 1172, that seems to be a misprint of Goetz and Schoell (for *abaetis*, Brugmann, or *abitis*). At any rate there seems no reason why conjectural forms should not be marked with an asterisk,<sup>1</sup> under the heading of 'forma,' as they are under that of 'significatio.'

The following are passages in which improvements might be made under the head of 'significatio.' On p. 57 that rubric really contains nothing about the meaning of the word *adulescens*, but simply an enumeration of the passages in which its cases appear; nor is there much to say about meaning, except that the word is sometimes used without reference to age, just as the English 'old fellow,' 'old man' may be applied to one who is not old; cp. Most. 653, Rud. 941: and that it may be applied to a young woman (Mil. 966). On p. 82 *vi agis mecum*, Rud. 733, is not an instance of *agere* = *disputare*. On p. 41 under the rubric 'de tempore quo quicquam accidit' (which I suppose means 'relating to the time at which something happens'—read *aliquid* for *quicquam*), we find *ad annos sedecim*, Rud. 1422, but this phrase, whatever it may mean, cannot mean 'at sixteen years'; nor can *ad ludos Olympios* in Stich. 306 mean 'at the time of the Olympic games.'<sup>2</sup> It may be added

that the rubric 'de tempore quousque actio continuatur' on p. 40 (last line) is not really adequate to some of the instances cited under it, e.g. *ad ravim* Aul. 336, *ad languorem*, Pseud. 216, etc. What we want is something like 'terminus ad quem'; in other words there is no essential difference between the instances cited here and those cited under C above (p. 39); the fact that some of the instances contain a noun denoting time (e.g. *ad uesperum*) makes no essential difference, or, if it does, then the rubric 'de tempore' ought to have been strictly limited to these instances.

I will add a brief reference to a few other passages in which there are mistakes or misprints: p. 19 *absentium*, Stich. 4, should not have the place of honour (P have *absentum*); p. 60 *aduorsus* does not occur 'post pron.' in Trin. 724, nor 'post subst.' in Poen. 725 (where it governs not *rem* but *leges*); p. 71 instances of the abl. and dat. of *aetas* are put under the heading 'nom. vel acc.'; p. 41 r, l. 19 Capt. 575 should be 573; p. 47, l. 25 *manum* should be *manus*; p. 31, l. 54 *quem* should be *quam*; p. 9, l. 4 the reference should have been to p. 8 of Brugmann's treatise. A slip of a more serious character occurs on p. 73, where *adfectam*, Rud. 418 is cited under *adfecto* instead of under *adfectio*, p. 75. On p. 83 under *age sis* might now be added Rud. 481 (as a conjecture, see my ed. min. of this play).

Possibly Prof. Lodge may be able to take account of some of the points of view indicated above in future fascicles; he will at any rate agree with me in wishing to secure that so laborious and important a book should make its appearance in as correct a form as possible. I should also have preferred to see the spellings *adfecto*, *adfero*, *adfatum*, *adpotus*, *adprime*, etc., which he adopts in the citations, reproduced in the headings under which these words are ranged (instead of *affecto*, *affero*, etc.). But it is too late now to consider this point.

E. A. SONNENSCHIEIN.

July 12th, 1902.

for he puts it under the head of 'vi finali' (2, b, p. 40) as well as under the head referred to above. The real meaning, I take it, is 'after the fashion of the Olympic games'; i.e. the instance ought to come under 'vi comparativa' (G, p. 40).

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *abitendi*, under *abaeto*, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> As to the meaning of *ad ludos Olympios* Prof. Lodge does not seem to have made up his own mind;

OGILVIE'S *HORAE LATINAE*.

*Horae Latinae: Studies in Synonyms and Syntax.* By the late ROBERT OGILVIE, M.A., LL.D. Edited by ALEXANDER SOUTER, M.A. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1901. Pp. xxiii. and 339. 12s. 6d. net.

IN the British Isles, where classical composition is reputed to flourish, the theoretical study of synonyms has been neglected, and there is room for such a book as this. Dr. Ogilvie's work is clearly the outcome of long and loving studies in the best period of Latin prose—in Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Nepos, and Livy. The results are here given in a series of about five hundred articles arranged in the alphabetical order of English words and expressions, e.g. honour, hope, horse, on horseback, host, hour, how. The method may best be shewn by an example. Under *Hope* first 'sperare' and 'optare' are distinguished, with four illustrations; then the constructions with the future infinitive, with 'posse' and 'velle,' with the present or the perfect infinitive, the use of 'ut spero' and 'non spero,' and the constructions of 'optare,' are explained and illustrated in turn; and the whole article takes up about a page and a half.

The faults of the book will appear from the following first harvest of criticisms on pages 1-100.

*A* or *an*.—The author seems to imply that 'he sold the book for a denar' must be translated by 'uno denario.' What of Cato's saying 'quod non opus est asse carum est'? The rule by which 'unum' is to be added to 'diem' but not to 'annum' is not absolute: see Cic. in Verr. ii. 52. 129 'eximi iubet non diem ex mense sed ex anno unum dimidiatumque mensem.' 'Here,' says Dr. Ogilvie, '*diem* is sufficiently defined by the context; besides, *non unum diem* would mean more than one day.' This is special pleading: there would have been no ambiguity of the kind. In the quotation from Livy xli. 28. 1 'unum' is omitted—a vital mistake. Cic. in Cat. iv. 11. 24 'habetis eum consulum qui parere non dubitet' is translated '*would not hesitate to obey*.' In the quotation from Cic. de off. i. 27 the punctuation is at fault.

*Abandon*.—The distinction between 'desero' and 'destituo' is overdrawn. Cic. Phil. ii. 46. 118 'defendi rem publicam

adulescens, non deseram senex: contempsi Catilinae gladios, non pertimescam tuos.' Were the swords of Antony not a 'threatening' but only a 'possible' danger? Kühner on Tusc. ii. 14. 33 has chosen the better part: '*deserere est nostrum in Stiche lassen, ...idemque fere valet quod destituere*.'

*Accompany*.—The examples shew, what might have been said, that 'prosequi' means to see the last of a man.

*Accuse*.—'Insimulare' does not necessarily imply false accusation: see Cic. in Caecin. 1. 3, J. H. H. Schmidt, *Lat. u. gr. Synonymik*, § 10. 5.

*Across*.—The article might seem to be written and the examples chosen with a view to condemning, e.g. 'copias trans fluvium duxit.' But see Livy xxi. 26. 6 'omnibus ferme suis trans Rhodanum traiecit,' Cic. pro Quint. 3. 12, etc.

*After*.—'When post quam and postea quam go with the subjunctive, it is for some collateral reason.' This neglects a considerable number of passages in Cicero: see Dräger, *Hist. Syntax*, ii. p. 591. 'Post' is often omitted after an ablative of time, always after postero die, postridie. 'Post' in some form precedes the 'quam' in all the examples given save Livy vi. 29: 'die vicensimo quam creatus erat.' This idiom does not seem to occur before Livy. On the other hand no notice is taken of the usage seen in Cic. pro Rosc. Am. 7. 20: 'quatrduo quo haec gesta sunt.'

*Although*.—'Licet...followed by the subjunctive with ut omitted = one may.' Is not this omission of 'ut' a figment? It may be remarked in passing that Lewis and Short's only instance of 'licet ut,' Cic. p. Mur. 4. 8, is false: the 'ut' clause depends on 'est integrum': see Heitland's note.

*Angry*.—In Sen. Dial. 3. 4, 'iracundus non potest aliquando iratus non esse,' the first 'non' should clearly be cut out.

*Any*.—Cic. ad Fam. iii. 10. 6: 'ubi cuiquam legationi fui impedimento?' It is rash to call this an example of a masculine form of 'quisquam' with a feminine substantive. Caes. b. c. iii. 73. 3: 'habendam Fortunae gratiam, quod Italiam sine aliquo vulnere cepissent.' This difficult use of the adjective should not be quoted (p. 22), or at least should be explained.

*Appear*.—Among the examples of change from the personal to the impersonal construction with 'videtur' is Cic. Ac. ii. 23.



74: 'furere tibi Empedocles videtur, at mihi dignissimum rebus eis, de quibus loquitur.' Cicero could never have written this. Reference to an edition shews that 'sonitum fundere' is omitted after 'loquitur' and that the passage has no business here.

*As.*—Cic. ad Att. iv. 18. 4: 'id ego puto ut multa eiusdem ad nihil recasurum.' This use of 'ut' is out of place in a list of such things as Cic. Ac. ii. 31: 'homo acutus ut Poenus.'

*As far as.*—To quote here Cic. Brut. 68, 'quod scire possum' is an error in principle as well as in fact.

*Assembly.*—'Concilium, an assembly which accepts or refuses the proposals of one or more chief speakers; consilium, an assembly where each member gives his opinion.' 'Concilium' has no sense so special as this.

*Attain.*—The examples of 'persequi,' in both of which the word means 'enumerate,' are out of place.

*Deny.*—Cic. in Verr. iv (which should be v). 21. 52: 'dices frumentum Mamertinos non debere.' This illustrates neither 'nego' nor 'non dico,' and needs a note. In § 3 the personal construction with 'negor' should not be mentioned without a warning. It is never used by Caesar, and apparently once only by Cicero, p. Caecin. 15. 44, where it is palliated by the context.

*Divide.*—The rules for 'divido' and 'distribuo' need modification. No account is taken of such things as 'quadragena milia nummum in singulos iudices distributa' (Cic. p. Clu. 27. 74) or 'quos...circum familias conventus Campaniae...distribuit' (Caes. b. c. i. 14. 5). The reference to Livy xxi. 27 is wrong,

*Drink.*—This article must be corrected

from pp. 113–5 of the *Classical Review*. No allowance is made for the approximation of the meanings of 'bibo' and 'poto' in the continuous tenses, and 'potatum' is said to be 'used instead of bibitum.'

*Each other.*—No distinction is drawn between e.g. 'inter sese aspiciabant' (Cic. in Cat. iii. 5) and 'ingens certamen tribunis et inter se ipsos et cum consule fuit' (Livy xxxix. 39).

It should now be clear that scientific precision is not Dr. Ogilvie's strong point. But inaccuracy, and still more incompleteness, is to be pardoned in a work which covers so much ground as this. The worst fault of the book as a whole is the lack of a complete index of English words. If Dr. Ogilvie's principal object was, as the editor tells us, to aid the composer of Latin prose, it should be made easy for the composer of Latin prose to find the place where Dr. Ogilvie discusses each English word. The table of contents (pp. xix–xxiii) merely repeats the headings of the articles. Take for instance the word 'continuo.' If the composer wants a Latin word for 'necessarily,' what is to guide him to the article on 'continue'? If he wants a phrase for 'on purpose,' why should he look at 'diligence'? Dr. Ogilvie's articles in fact are arranged partly by English and partly by Latin groups, and his literary executors have not corrected this ambiguity.

Composers, and especially teachers of composition, will do well to buy this book; but it will not be easy to get all that is good out of it, and it will not be hard to get bad with the good.

E. HARRISON.

#### GREENIDGE'S ROMAN PUBLIC LIFE.

*Roman Public Life.* By A. H. J. GREENIDGE. London: Macmillan & Co. Pp. 451. 10s. 6d.

AN apology is due to the author for the delay, now of nearly ten months, in the review of this important work. Circumstances combined to defeat earlier endeavour, and the task was not to be perfunctory. Now, the impressions of an attentive perusal can be summed up in one sentence: this must for many years be the standard manual for English students of the subject. This

is not to say that Mr. Greenidge has been equally successful everywhere. In the sketch of the earliest rudiments of Roman society the author has not escaped the lamentable dulness which always seems to attend every attempt made since Niebuhr to handle that period. The burden of correlating the detached facts left after manifold sifting, crushes the life and interest from the section: and the manual becomes a catalogue. The last section of the book—the account of the officials under the Principate—comes perilously near the same fate, but here there



is sufficient definiteness and certainty to save the situation. Apart from these two sections—and in a second edition the author might well follow J. R. Green's example, and rewrite them, resolved to make them interesting—the whole work exhibits a satisfying combination of French clarity and German thoroughness. If we regret the old-fashioned easiness and breadth of treatment which allowed more discursive comparison with modern instances—only on his last page does the author permit himself a reference to the 'new oecumenical church' which arose to overshadow the Empire—yet we may accept with abundant satisfaction the clear presentment of cause and effect, of growth and atrophy, of conflict and reconciliation in the various elements of Roman government, the wealth of facts duly mentioned, and the copious references to the ultimate authorities. The student, doubtless, in present opinion, can supply modern analogies and contrasts for himself. Certainly he need no longer weary himself with foreign handbooks: until he embarks on authorship this book may suffice him.

It is unnecessary to analyse the book: suffice it to say that beginning with an account of Rome's earliest constitution, the author traces its growth from its primitive elements with its family organisation and monarchy, through the developed Republic to the Principate in Rome, Italy, and the Provinces.

Worthy of special commendation are the pages in which the author indicates the results of the struggle between the orders (pp. 128–131), and above all the chapter on the Senate in the developed Republic, which reveals a sureness of touch and an enthusiasm of interest that leave nothing to desire. Scarcely less stimulating is the chapter on the transition to the Principate: if Mr. Greenidge would leave nothing undone, he should, when the next edition is called for, devote a page to adumbrating the resemblances between that transition and the present instincts of our own people, and another to showing how the *consecratio capitis*, the power of the censors who performed the lustration, the distinction between election and the *lex curiata* find their counterparts in Christian excommunication, the struggles between King-Emperor and Church or Pope, and the distinction between the election and confirmation of bishops.

The maintenance of the Roman Senate at a normal strength of 600 by the annual addition of 20 ex-quaestors might with advantage be compared to the repletion of

the Areopagus from the ex-archons. The Roman life-expectation as it appears from these figures is all but identical with modern actuaries' tables; it is fair therefore to suppose that at Athens nearly the same was true. The Areopagus then, would be some 270 in number—a body large enough to supply several committees of 50 to try manslaughter cases at Phreatto, the Delphinium, and the Palladium. The name *ἐφέται* would thus find its explanation; while the sentence of Pollux, *κατεγλάσθη τὸ τῶν ἐφετῶν δικαστήριον* which has so exercised the student of Greek Antiquities, is nothing but an unverified echo, a confused recollection, from Thucydides iii. 83, *καὶ τὸ εἵθεος καταγλασθὲν ἡφανίσθη*. (For the confusion *ἐφέτης* = *εἰρήνης* through a late pronunciation of *v* and *φ*, cf. the variants *ἐκκοφθήσεται* and *ἐκκανθήσεται* in Plato, *Rep.* 361 E and Dr. Tucker's note.)

To increase the serviceability of the book, some obscurities might be removed in a second edition: p. 73, lines 4–6; p. 83 from 'The second power, on the other hand' (in p. 125, again, the use of the word 'formal' is far from clear);

p. 110, line 29, 'one of this character';

pp. 124, line 28, 126, line 13; (the author seems to waver as to the character of the Publilian law);

p. 136, lines 3–6 and note 1;

p. 159, line 21: (the difference between a *contio populi* and *plebis* is not kept clear);

p. 204, line 22, 'the appointment of a praetor';

p. 210, line 13, 'damage by wild beasts on the public roads';

p. 222, 'corporeal' and 'incorporeal';

p. 236, 'paucity of criminal judges';

p. 250, note 2, (Varro needs further consideration);

p. 409, line 18, ('since' is confusing. It seems a German substitution for 'after')

p. 410, note 7, (the subject of the sentence should be stated).

Occasionally we have inelegancies that are perhaps unnoticed misprints: p. 111, note 4, 'thus is described'; p. 259, last line, 'ferret out'; p. 264, 'to half complete'; p. 284, lines 15–16; p. 316, lines 21, 24, 'annex,' 'annexe'; p. 396, note 1, 'opposite.'

And, in some places, not merely questionable but improbable details need to be reconsidered.

p. 75, note 1, p. 79, note 2, see M. Bréal's *Semantics*, p. 111.

p. 95, ad fin. Evidence should be quoted.

p. 101, lines 4–7. The author is unnecessarily despondent. His suggestion, p. 102, lines 1–4 is clearly right. The object

of the change was to give weight to the independent peasants.

p. 105. The paraphrase of Tac. Ann. iii. 27, *finis aequi iuris* is shown to be wrong by Tacitus's next sentence.

p. 158, note 3. Was the *plebiscitum* merely to prevent a veto on the conferment by the Senate for one day of the *imperium*?

p. 177, line 6. Could the tribune use the intercession against the censor?

p. 177, last two lines. What is the evidence for this statement?

p. 210, note 7. († *quae iubet*.) Tyrrell interprets this law as referring to weights and measures (cf. p. 211, note 1).

p. 291, note 2. Insufficient weight seems to have been attached to the precise words of Polybius, *ἐπειδὴν ὁμόση δημοσίᾳ πίστεα*. Livy describes this public oath only. In the author's translation of Polyb. 'only' might better be 'alone.'

p. 312, note 1. Appian's text should receive some further comment.

p. 350. No explanation occurs anywhere of the *Papia-Poppaean* law.

p. 402. Are not all the authorities reconciled by distinguishing (1) *equites*, the class of *ingenui* who possessed the equestrian census and (2) *equites equo publico*? Freedmen, possessed of the census, tried to foist themselves into the first class, and to assume the gold ring which indicated that the wearer was not only wealthy, but *ingenunus*.

Two matters Mr. Greenidge hardly seems to have probed sufficiently, the early forms of testament, and the Servian divisions (p. 70).

As to the first, a careful consideration of Gaius and the other authorities shows that *in procinctu* referred originally to the gathering in the *Campus Martius* prepara-

tory to marching out to battle: as campaigns extended, and armies marched further afield, the testamentary power extended also; a soldier sent to Spain might not anticipate fighting when he left Rome, and made his will *in procinctu* on discovering in Spain that battle was imminent. Again, reflexion shows that a testament made *calatis comitiis* would be in favour of an adopted heir before it was used to favour one or other of the testator's natural heirs; for since this testament was made in time of peace, the testator could, had he so wished, himself in his lifetime have made disposition of his property to some extent.

Of mere misprints there are not many: p. 60, note 2 (2 accents); p. 61, note 5, add 'cf. p. 77, note 2'; p. 81, note 1 (*τῶ*); p. 156, note 2 (*erga duces*); p. 160, note 4 after 'see p. 61' add 'and p. 77, note 2'; p. 169, note 7 (accent); p. 174, note 8 (*iret*); p. 186, note 5 (accent); p. 222, note 4 (*eorum*); p. 223, note 2 (*humillimorum*); p. 244, note 5 (accent); p. 253, note 2, the reading < *equitum* > before 'ita' should be mentioned; p. 257, note 2, p. 164 sqq.; p. 259, note 7, *apparitores*; p. 280, note 1 (*iudicaverat*); p. 286, note 4 (*τῶ*); p. 303, note 1 (*condicionis*); so p. 400, note 1; p. 320, note 2 after p. 231 add 'and p. 321'; p. 349, note 3 (*comitiis*); p. 351, note 7. The usual reference X. 8 should also be given for Pliny's letter. Is 'vacent' correct? p. 353, note 4 (accents); p. 370, note 6 (*tribunus*); p. 372, note 4 (accent); p. 392, line 7 (*retractatio*), note 4 (plus); p. 393, note 1 (*liberetur*!); p. 400, note 6 (accent); 418, note 1: 430, note 3; p. 418, note 4 (*Britanniae*!).

T. NICKLIN.

#### BRENNAN'S TRANSLATIONS INTO LATIN VERSE.

*Terra Paterna Vale*. By the Rev. N. J. BRENNAN, C. S. Sp., B.A., President of Rockwell College, Dublin, Gill and Son. 1901. Pp. 8, 158. 2s.

THE appearance of Father Brennan's *Terra Paterna Vale* is noteworthy in more ways than one. The motive for its present publication, assigned in the preface as 'the prominence now given to the study of Latin verse in the new programme of Irish Intermediate education,' the devotion which it shows to a poet who was probably never less

read than he is in England to-day, and the freedom of its Latinity and versification, which indeed takes liberties not permitted to the stricter school of modern composers, are all interesting features.

A translation of a whole poem or a complete section of one, such as Merivale's of *Hyperion* and Lyttelton's of *Comus*, ought not to be judged by the same standard as the versions of shorter extracts carefully selected by their translators. In a long modern composition there must be much which defies translation and where the

amount of the failure is the only gauge of success. Allowing for this and for the difference of ideal already referred to, Father Brennan may be said to have produced a version which is somewhat more than meritorious. We may doubt if the stanzas of Childe Harold are readily translatable into Latin heroics. But what metre would have been more appropriate? Father Brennan is a faithful translator, and so the sombre sameness of the original is reflected in the version.

I quote one of the most successful of his renderings, the 19th Stanza, which will give an idea of the task and its performance:

The horrid crags, by toppling convent  
crown'd,  
The cork-trees hoar that clothe the shaggy  
steep,  
The mountain-moss by scorching skies  
imbrown'd,  
The sunken glen, whose sunless shrubs  
must weep,  
The tender azure of the unruffled deep,  
The orange tints that gild the greenest  
bough,  
The torrents that from cliff to valley leap,  
The vine on high, the willow branch below,  
Mix'd in one mighty scene, with varied  
beauty glow.

Horrida saxa quibus dominans supereminet  
aedes,

canaque quae praeceps abruptum subera  
velant,  
montanus rapidis muscus fulgoribus ustus,  
saltus, ubi sudant frutices sine sole, profundus,  
caeruleum placidi purum sine momine ponti,  
quique color ramos viridantes flavus inaurat,  
spumeus in vallem saliens de rupibus  
amnis,  
infra lenta salix, supra vindemia pinguis,  
conspectu grandi vario splendore coruscant.

Father Brennan's elegiacs and lyrics are inferior to his hexameters. But one of his pentameters deserves quoting for itself

dira lues vitae mens memor ipsa sui.

It is in my judgment much superior to the original

'The blight of life—the Demon Thought.'

The author asks for corrections of mistakes: I have noticed *vidēretur, caeli* (plural), *peredit* (ind. pres., see *C.R.* March 1902, p. 110), *rudens* for 'shrieking,' *diffugiens* of a single person.

The booklet includes a few original poems in Latin which, especially one dealing with a football match in the Vale of Clonmel, suggest that their author might turn his thoughts to the Hoesuffian competitions.

J. P. P.

#### PERRY'S *SANCTA PAULA*.

*Sancta Paula; a Romance of the Fourth Century, A.D.* By WALTER COPLAND PERRY. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1902. 6s.

WHAT reception this book will receive from the general public we may see by and bye. In the meantime one may be permitted to doubt whether it will be popular. The author has amassed an immense quantity of facts bearing on the fourth century, and works them into his story, or, more truly, twines his story through them, with great enthusiasm. Unfortunately, his knowledge is hardly accurate enough to make his book a work of reference, nor is his story strong enough to wear its weight of learning like a flower.

The author, running short of authorities, has tried to patch the fourth century with the Augustan period in a most disconcerting

way. Paula's maids all come out of Horace, Chloe, Pyrrha, Leuconoe, Canidia, and so forth, and seem uncertain to which period they belong. Canidia, for example, dabbles in magic—not without reminiscences of Horace's *Satires*. Neaera becomes the *agapeta* of a priest. One of Paula's suitors is Telephus. After Paula's marriage (on the lines of the Prayer Book), an Anacreontic ode is sung on her arrival at home (p. 85). (It is a little surprising to find so much Greek in Rome at the time.) Toxotius is hailed in the streets—'Ave! Ave! clarus Anchisae Venerisque sanguis' (p. 79). We know from Ammianus and Jerome what sort of things the Roman mob did call out (*per te ille discat*, for example), but Horace was surely not so familiar. The 'staid Christian widow, Corinna' (p. 137), and the 'rich Marcus Croesus (not the triumvir)' (p. 7) are also a little astonishing. Then we hear a

good deal in the novel of the Emperor Valentinian being at Rome. History seems to show that he never was there. Nor was Ausonius. Claudian too seems not to have appeared in Rome till about a quarter of a century after Mr. Perry's characters quote him. Indeed I am not clear that Valentinian was even Emperor at all when Paula married. Let the author have the benefit of the doubt.

Ammianus laughs at the Roman fancy for new-fangled names, citing or inventing Reburus. Cinara (one of Paula's Horatian maids) points out Marius Maecius Maemius Furius Balburius Caecilianus Placidus, who is happily shortened to 'Marius Maecius etcetera.' The menu at the marriage suggests the first rather than the fourth century. Mr. Perry quotes Macrobius on fourth century feasting, so that it is odd that Paula's family should go back to the Satirists. It is indeed a 'dubious feast' (p. 91). The 'ball' too, is rather indeterminate; is it British, or does it lean to Herodias' daughter

and the *ambubaias*? I do not think either would have won Damasus' blessing. 'Patrician' is a word of various meanings—it means one thing in early Roman history, another in Gibbon, and a third—let us say—in Disraeli; what it means in this book, I do not know. Nor do I know any authority for the statement (p. 15) that the 'common herd of plebeians,' the '*colluvies gentium*,' 'could still bestow consulships, provinces, and legions.' Nor am I clear as to Toxotius' real feelings when his wife 'put off the *toga praetextata* of maidenhood and assumed the *toga recta* of the married woman' (p. 99).

Turning to the other side of the book, one may ask, will it do as a novel? It is full of Latin quotations—odd enough, some of them ('all the various noises that went to make up the *streptitumque Romae*' p. 78)—and I incline to think that these will militate against its success with any class of readers to whom the character-drawing and dialogue might appeal.

T. R. GLOVER.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### LATIN AND THE UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM.

'LATIN [it is true] is an optional subject for matriculation at the University last founded in England.' This statement, made in the July number of the *Classical Review* of the present year, though true so far as it goes, nevertheless requires to be supplemented, if it is to represent accurately the situation in the University of Birmingham. Latin is an optional subject for matriculation in the Faculties of Science and Commerce at Birmingham, but not for matriculation in the Faculties of Arts and Medicine. In other words, Arts students and Medical students must pass in Latin at the Birmingham matriculation examination, but Science and Commerce students need not. The Birmingham solution of the question of Latin at the matriculation depends, therefore, on faculty differentiation; what is requisite as a preparation for a University course in one line of study is not, it is held, necessarily requisite for all lines of study. And in basing its scheme on the requirements of the several Faculties of the University, Birmingham at the same time recognises that there exist and should exist many different types of schools from which the

University may hope to draw students. At the recent matriculation examination, however, of 115 candidates over 100 offered Latin as one of their two foreign languages.

A word may be added on the character of the examination in Latin at the Birmingham matriculation. Each candidate has to offer a set book chosen by himself (subject to the approval of the University); but the examination on this set book is conducted *viva voce*. The written examination is limited to translation at sight, grammar, and composition. In this way, it is hoped, the difficulties connected with set books may be to some extent avoided; though, at the same time, the University has to face the new difficulty of examining all candidates *viva voce*—a difficulty which in the case of a University with a very large number of candidates for matriculation might prove insurmountable. But at any rate the Birmingham method of dealing with this question avoids embarrassing schools by prescribing a single book which they must all read, however unsuitable it may happen to be to the class in which it is studied; and it also avoids the peril of abolishing set



books altogether and so jeopardizing the literary element in classical study. The passages set for unseen translation are not all of them taken from classical authors. By setting (among other passages) one which has been specially written for the purpose of the examination, it is possible to provide a really easy piece of Latin, failure to translate which implies ignorance of the very elements of the language; and such passages may moreover be multiplied *ad infinitum*, so that there will be no difficulty in providing easy passages which are 'unseen' in fact as well as in name; whereas, if unseens had always to be taken from classical authors the stock of really easy passages would ultimately become exhausted, as was pointed out in the *Classical Review*. No doubt many scholars object to modern Latin, even though written in a classical style; but they may be willing to waive their objections in view of the positive advantage possessed by passages written or

adapted *ad hoc*—viz. simplicity or just such a degree of difficulty as is desired for the purpose of the examination.

E. A. SONNENSCHN. —

[We gladly insert Professor Sonnenschein's interesting communication. The remarks, however, which are quoted at the beginning of his letter were not intended to be a complete definition of the place of Latin in the matriculation scheme of Birmingham University, for which purpose they were of course inadequate, but to serve as part of a proof that the ancient languages were losing their commanding position of former days.

Since they were written, there have been more signs of the times. Latin is no longer a compulsory subject for cadetships in the Royal Navy, and Oxford is to be asked in the present term to make Greek optional in Responsions.—ED. C. R.]

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

### THE GOLDEN BOUGH AND THE REX NEMORENSIS.

*The Golden Bough.* A Study in Magic and Religion. By J. G. FRAZER, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. Vols. I.—III. Macmillan & Co. 1900. 36s. net.

DR. FRAZER'S *Golden Bough* has grown apace. It now extends over three octavo volumes instead of the previous two. Nor is this all; for the thinnest of the new volumes is thicker than either of the old, and they are printed in a slightly smaller type with forty lines to a page instead of thirty-four. The second edition of the book is in fact considerably more than twice the size of the first. It may be worth while to suggest that, if a third edition is needed (and it will be), the long lists of customs and ceremonies on which the author bases his conclusions should be given, say, in brevier while the conclusions themselves are stated, as at present, in small pica. This would be doubly advantageous. It would save space. And it would enable—I will not say, the casual reader to skim the book—but the student, when he re-reads it, to pick out more readily the main lines of the argument.

Again, it is to be hoped that a future edition will be illustrated throughout. Illustrations in any work dealing with anthropological or ethnological questions are of real importance—a fact long since appreciated by the publishers of such periodicals as the *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* or *L'Anthropologie* or the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*. Nor would it be difficult to get together typical representations of the various customs described in Dr. Frazer's work. Anthropologists and ethnologists rely for the most part on data supplied by ethnographers; and ethnographical books are nowadays almost always illustrated. Besides, folk-lore collections are springing up everywhere: museums, public and private, abound in objects of interest to the student of comparative religion. To give but a single instance—the one nearest to hand—our Cambridge Archaeological Museum possesses an interesting series of corn-mothers and corn-babies, including a beautifully plaited specimen from Greece originally obtained by Mr. W. H. D. Rouse<sup>1</sup> and deposited by the Folk Lore Society in 1898, and a 'harvest-maiden' from Perth presented by Dr.

<sup>1</sup> See Mr. Rouse's remarks in *Folk-Lore* vii. 147 and in his *Gk. Votive Offerings* p. 50, n. 1.

Frazer himself in 1889: several of these might well be photographed to illustrate vol. ii. p. 171 ff. of *The Golden Bough*. Our local collection has also a *corp-chrè* from Islay, Scotland, stuck full of pins, and a lemon and potato from Naples fairly bristling with pins and nails (cp. vol. i. p. 17f.); not to mention various samples of magical knots, etc. (vol. i. p. 392 ff.). As it is, Dr. Frazer has been content with two illustrations—a spray of mistletoe designed for the cover by the late Prof. J. H. Middleton, and the frontispiece, a reproduction of Turner's 'Golden Bough.' Both of these are beautiful<sup>1</sup> rather than useful.

Passing from externals to internals, we note that the main plan of the work remains unaltered. It is still an attempt to account for the ritual of Diana Nemorensis by a thorough-going investigation of those principles, and those principles only, that bear upon her cult as conceived by the author. Failure to recognize Dr. Frazer's self-imposed limits has led to a good deal of misunderstanding. It has been widely thought by inattentive readers that tree-worship was here offered as a master-key before which all the manifold chambers of mythology would fly open. Occasionally even an attentive reader has made the same mistake. Mr. Andrew Lang (*Magic and Religion* p. 205f.) remarks: 'Mythology has been of late emancipated from the universal dominion of the sun, but only to fall under that of gods of vegetation, whether of vegetable life at large, or of the corn spirit and the oak spirit in particular.' He enumerates twenty or more gods and demi-gods who have got 'mixed up with plant life' in the *Golden Bough*. But of those that he mentions some are undoubtedly connected with vegetation (e.g. Demeter, Dionysus, Jack-in-the-Green) and others have claims that can hardly be denied (e.g. Adonis, Attis, Linus, Lityerses, Tammuz). There remain certain cases in which Dr. Frazer may or may not have worked his hypothesis too hard: these require individual criticism, not wholesale condemnation. And if in any instance such criticism should disprove the alleged vegetable affinities, Dr. Frazer would be the first to retract his view. This, at least, is his attitude, if we may judge from his own

<sup>1</sup> Both, to speak the truth, have suffered somewhat in the second edition. The mistletoe was more effective as originally issued, without a framework of horizontal lines. And the autotype of Turner's picture is poor in comparison with the former impression, the plate presumably being worn.

words. In the Preface to his first edition (p. vii.) he wrote: 'Now that the theory, which necessarily presented itself to me at first in outline, has been worked out in detail, I cannot but feel that in some places I may have pushed it too far. If this should prove to have been the case, I will readily acknowledge and retract my error as soon as it is brought home to me. Meantime my essay may serve its purpose as a first attempt to solve a difficult problem, and to bring a variety of scattered facts into some sort of order and system.' But, even if Dr. Frazer has in some cases pushed his theory too far (and I shall later on try to show that he has), that is no reason for assigning him to a 'new school of mythology,' still less for speaking contemptuously of his 'Covent Garden' propensities. One would have thought that a sufficient protest had been entered by Dr. Frazer himself, at any rate in the Preface to his second edition, where he says (p. xvii.): 'No one can well be more sensible than I am of the immense variety and complexity of the forces which have gone towards the building up of religion; no one can recognize more frankly the futility and inherent absurdity of any attempt to explain the whole vast organism as the product of any one simple factor. If I have hitherto touched, as I am quite aware, only the fringe of a great subject—fingered only a few of the countless threads that compose the mighty web,—it is merely because neither my time nor my knowledge has hitherto allowed me to do more. Should I live to complete the works for which I have collected and am collecting materials, I dare to think that they will clear me of any suspicion of treating the early history of religion from a single narrow point of view.' After this we have no right to suggest that *der Baumkultus* is to Dr. Frazer what the sun was to Signor de Gubernatis, or allegorical science to Messrs. Fitz Simon, or any other *nostrum* to any other *nos*.

But, while fully recognizing that Dr. Frazer is not a man of one idea, we may be permitted to doubt whether he has hit upon the best method for expressing his views. He takes a particular priesthood as his theme and finds that, in order to solve the problems by which it is beset, he must first discuss certain large and comprehensive questions—the relation between Magic and Religion, Incarnate Gods, Tree-worship, Animal-worship, Taboo, Primitive conceptions of the Soul, &c., &c. This discussion, which occupies ninety-nine per cent. of his pages, enables him ultimately to arrive at a more or

less probable hypothesis with regard to the cult that formed his point of departure. Now there is doubtless something to be said in favour of the method here employed. Like the biographical treatment of history, it enlists our sympathies at the outset in an individual case, and from first to last exhibits the formative influence of general tendencies on a special career. We get a concrete example of abstract principles and are interested accordingly. But the wise historian will not dilate on political and social movements at such a length that we forget the personality of his hero. If he has so much to say on the life of the period he will write a general history, not a biography at all. And, in my opinion, Dr. Frazer would have been well advised to recast his materials in a wider mould, or even to reserve them for that 'general work on primitive superstition and religion,' which, he tells us (Pref. to first ed. p. vii), he has for some time past been preparing. He would thus have avoided the aesthetic error of disproportion. It may be said that science is exempt from artistic criticism. But Dr. Frazer virtually invites it. He is an artist in words as well as a scientist in thought—witness many passages in his great edition of Pausanias—and he does his best to relieve a long and erudite task by stylistic grace, *musaeo contingens cuncta lepore*. But the very beauty of his opening and closing pages heightens our sense of incongruity: we mentally contrast the sympathetic and imaginative paragraphs on Nemi with the dry and voluminous catalogues of fact by which they are separated. For, unlike the author of the book of Job, Dr. Frazer writes his prologue and epilogue in poetry, his intervening scenes in prose.

There is another and a more serious objection to the present form of the *Golden Bough*. Dr. Frazer's explanation of the Arician cult cannot be regarded as certainly correct. At best it is a hypothesis that fits the facts. But if at any time a more convincing hypothesis should be propounded (and the case is quite conceivable), then the collapse of Dr. Frazer's framework might discredit the remainder of his fabric. This would of course be unfair; but it is not in human nature to read the sermon if the preacher misinterprets the text. Since the publication of Dr. Frazer's second edition more than one rival hypothesis has actually been put forward. If these or others like them should find acceptance, many collections of solid facts and not a few brilliant combinations of the same would run the risk of being

neglected. It is surely a pity that real gems should be jeopardised on account of the uncertain value of their setting.

Since, however, Dr. Frazer has deliberately chosen to set forth his views in the form of a commentary on the Arician priesthood, we must follow his order and deal first with the particular cult and then with the larger questions involved in it.

In vol. i., pp. 1-6, Dr. Frazer records 'the few facts and legends which have come down to us' with regard to the cult at Nemi. This record is fairly complete: but, considering the length at which the subject is to be treated, we expect it to be exhaustive. Yet some pieces of evidence do not appear till later on in the book, while others are not mentioned at all. As to the former, the important fact that the cult was the common cult of a Latin league only appears at p. 232, and sundry details concerning Hippolytus are relegated to vol. ii. p. 315, n. 2. As to the latter, Dr. Frazer might have traced the worship of Diana Nemorensis further both in space and in time: others, at least, have succeeded in so doing.

Professor G. Wissowa in his *Religion u. Kultus der Römer*, p. 200 f., has recently pointed out that the cult of Diana at Rome in many respects reproduced the cult of Diana at Nemi. Corresponding to the sacred precinct of Diana Nemorensis was the far-famed *aedes Dianae in Aventino*. Each of the two was the religious centre of a Latin federation: the Arician amphiktionny comprised Tusculum, Aricia, Lanuvium, Laurentum, Cora, Tibur, Pometia, and Ardea, as we gather from a fragment of Cato (*ap. Prisc. iv.*, p. 129 H., *cp. ibid. vii.*, p. 337 H.); the Aventine temple is called by Varro (*de ling. lat. 5. 43*) 'commune Latinorum Dianae templum.' The 'Lucus Dianius' at Nemi was said to have been consecrated by the Latin dictator Egerius Laevius of Tusculum (Cato, *loc. cit.*), or by a Manius Egerius (Fest. p. 145 Müller): the temple of Diana on the Aventine was, according to tradition, founded by Servius Tullius (Liv. 1. 45, Dion. Hal. 4.26, Zonar. 7.9, Aur. Vict. *vir. ill.* 7.9). The festival of Diana at Nemi in all probability fell on the Ides of August (Stat. *silv.* iii. 1. 59 f., Mart. xii. 67. 2): that of Diana at Rome did so too (see Mommsen

<sup>1</sup> These passages are not quite conclusive, as Dr. Frazer remarks in vol. i. p. 5 n. 2. But they are strongly supported by the fact that at Lanuvium Aug. 13 was the 'natis Dianae' (*C.I.L.* xiv. 2112 i. 5, ii. 12): see Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 201 n. 1. *Cp.* too Prof. J. Rendel Harris on Aug. 13 as the date of the festival of S. Hippolytus: see below.

in *C.I.L.* i.<sup>2</sup> p. 325). Through the sacred wood of Diana Nemorensis flowed a stream on whose banks the nymph Egeria was worshipped (Strab. 5. 239): the same divinity had a cult in the grove of the Camenae under the Aventine (Plut. *Num.* 13, Liv. i. 21, 3, Juv. 3. 11 ff.) To Egeria 'sacrificabant praegnantes, quod eam putabant facile conceptam alvum egerere' (Paul. p. 77), and at Nemi Diana was in a special sense a women's goddess (Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 199 f.): similarly at Rome on Aug. 13 women took particular pains to comb their hair neatly and to purify their heads (Plut. *quaestt. Rom.* 100), doubtless in honour of Diana's festival (Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 201), and none but women might enter the chapel of

Diana in the Vicus Patricius (Plut. *quaestt. Rom.* 3). Diana Nemorensis was also a goddess of fertility in general, extending her protection to animals of all sorts; this appears not only from the literary evidence cited by Birt in Roscher *Lex.* i. 1006, 62 ff., but from certain finds made at Nemi itself during the recent excavations and now preserved in the Nottingham Art Museum. They include two bronze hinds found at the entrance of the temple,<sup>1</sup> and several portions of a terra cotta frieze on which the *πόρνια θηρῶν* (*Il.* 21. 470: see Studniczka in Roscher *Lex.* ii. 1750, 52 ff., and P. Paris in Dar.-Sagl. *Dict. Ant.* ii. 152 f.) is represented grasping a lion in either hand, and ending below the waist in wings.<sup>2</sup> In pre-



TERRA-COTTA FRIEZE FROM THE PRECINCT AT NEMI.

cisely the same way the Aventine Diana was a goddess of fertility who watched over animal life; her cultus-statue was a copy of the Artemis of Marseilles (Strab. 4. 180), and therefore presumably of the well-known Ephesian type (*ib.* 179), while the horns of a fine cow said to have been sacrificed by Servius Tullius were to be seen on her walls (Plut. *quaestt. Rom.* 4, Liv. i. 45, 3 ff.). Undeniably, then, there are strong points of resemblance between the Arician and the Roman cults of Diana—so strong, in fact, that Wissowa regards the Roman cult as a daughter of the Arician (*op. cit.* p. 201). But Varro's statement (*de ling. lat.* 5. 74), that Diana-worship came to Rome from the Sabines and the assertions of Livy (i. 45, 2) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus

(4. 25) that the federal temple on the Aventine was a copy of the Ionian Artemision at Ephesus may be taken to imply that Arician descent was unknown to or disbelieved by these authorities. Probably we should do well to assume parallel development rather than direct borrowing either from Aricia or from elsewhere.

Again, we miss in Dr. Frazer's account of the cult at Nemi a recognition of the fact that it survived into the middle ages and survives today. Professor J. Rendel Harris has pointed out (*The Annotators of the*

<sup>1</sup> G. H. Wallis, *Illustrated Catalogue of the Nottingham Art Museum*, nos. 633-4, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* *ib.* nos. 602-4, p. 31, and photographic plate. I am indebted to Mr. G. H. Wallis for the illustration here given.



*Codex Bezae*, p. 102) that 'according to the Roman Calendar we have—

Aug. 13 SS. *Hippolyti* et Cassiani, Mm.

Aug. 15 *Assumptio B.V.M.*,

where Diana and Hippolytus still live for those who have eyes to see.' The same shrewd observer has detected traces of the old midsummer-ritual in a local *fésta*. For on a recent visit to Nemi he and the Rev. K. Lake learned that at a festival held there towards the end of summer the villagers go down to the shore of the lake, which is illuminated for the occasion. When we recall the date of the Arician festival, at 'the hottest time of the year' (*G.B.* i. 5<sup>1</sup>), and the 'multitude of torches, whose ruddy glare was reflected by the waters of the lake' (*G.B.* i. 5), we are entitled to ask whether we have not here a survival of the old ritual. The coincidence is at least worth noting.<sup>2</sup>

Lastly, the archaeological evidence for the cult at Nemi is rather summarily disposed of in the footnotes to pp. 2, 5. We might reasonably look for a more detailed account of the site excavated by Lord Savile in 1885-6. A plan of the remarkable precinct then laid bare with its buttress wall, its ancient paved road, its series of shrines (like those of Olympia), the basement of its temple, the *favissa* full of votive offerings, etc., etc., would serve to control our imagination and could easily be obtained from Mr. Wallis' *Catalogue* above mentioned. Would it have been possible also to trace the 'marble bas-relief, representing the combat between a priest and a candidate for his office...found at the foot of the hill of Aricia'?'<sup>3</sup>

Having marshalled his facts, Dr. Frazer raises two questions (p. 6): 'first, why had the priest to slay his predecessor? and second, why, before he slew him, had he to pluck the Golden Bough?' Fully to appreciate the author's answer to these questions, we must read his book; for it contains a cumulative argument drawn from analogous

practices among many imperfectly civilised communities, and resting ultimately on the conviction that human nature is the same all the world over. But the various stages of the argument can be fairly represented by the following abstract.

(1) Chapter i. contains, among other things, a survey of folk-customs relating to tree-worship. At the close of it (*G.B.* i. 230 ff.) Dr. Frazer draws certain inferences with regard to the cult at Nemi. (a) Tree-spirits are worshipped in woods, protect birds and beasts, help women in travail, send rain and sunshine, etc. Much the same is said of Diana Nemorensis. It follows that 'the cult of the Arician grove was essentially that of a tree-spirit.' (b) A tree-spirit is often represented by a living person, who is sometimes styled a king. 'May not then the King of the Wood in the Arician grove have been, like the King of May, the Leaf King, the Grass King, and the like, an incarnation of the tree-spirit?' (c) The tree-spirit is at times represented in double, not only by a living person but also by a bough. On the sacred tree in the Arician grove grew the Golden Bough, which had to be plucked by him who would assail the King. We infer 'the representation of the tree-spirit both by the King of the Wood and by the Golden Bough.'

Dr. Frazer next discusses numerous royal and priestly taboos (chapter ii.) and the practice of killing the divine king (chapter iii. § 1). This done, he again (*G.B.* ii. 59 f.) applies his conclusions to the *rex Nemorensis*. (a) His potent and therefore valuable life 'was probably hedged in by a system of elaborate precautions or taboos.' (b) 'The very value attached to the life of the man-god necessitates his violent death as the only means of preserving it from the inevitable decay of age.' The King of the Wood, therefore, 'had to be killed in order that the divine spirit, incarnate in him, might be transferred in unabated vigour to his successor.' (c) At first he may have been put to death 'at the end of a set period.' The rule that he held office till a stronger should slay him looks like a mitigation of this stern custom. Dr. Frazer seeks to strengthen his conjecture by sundry cases from North Europe, where the representative of the tree-spirit, usually 'slain in mimicry,' is allowed a chance for his life by flight. 'Flight,' we are to observe, 'figured conspicuously both in the legend and in the practice of the King of the Wood,' who had to be a runaway slave in memory of the flight of Orestes. (d) 'In Saxony and

<sup>1</sup> Correct the quotation from *Stat. silv.* iii. 1. 52 in *G.B.* i. p. 5 n. 2. Instead of 'tempus erat, caeli cum ardentissimus axis' etc. read '*torrentissimus*' for an obvious reason.

<sup>2</sup> In fairness to Dr. Frazer it must be said that these discoveries of Prof. J. Rendel Harris have been made *since* the appearance of the second edition of the *G.B.*

<sup>3</sup> G. H. Wallis *op. cit.* p. 11. Mr. Wallis informs me that the bas-relief in question is not in the Nottingham Museum; 'I have always,' he says, 'understood that the bas-relief was taken to Russia, but so far its whereabouts has not been traced.'

Thüringen the representative of the tree-spirit, after being killed, is brought to life again by a doctor.' So too Hippolytus, restored to life by Asklepios, became Virbius the first King of the Wood.

A further review of vegetation-cults enables Dr. Frazer to explain the tradition that Hippolytus-Virbius was killed by horses. 'Having found, first, that spirits of vegetation are not infrequently represented in the form of horses; and, second, that the animal which in later legends is said to have injured the god was sometimes originally the god himself, we may conjecture that the horses by which Virbius was said to have been slain were really embodiments of him as a deity of vegetation. The myth that Virbius had been killed by horses was probably invented to explain certain features in his worship, amongst others the custom of excluding horses from his sacred grove' (*G.B.* ii. 313 f.). 'If,' continues Dr. Frazer, 'we knew the ritual of the Arician grove better, we might find that the rule of excluding horses from it...was subject to an annual exception, a horse being once a year taken into the grove and sacrificed as an embodiment of the god Virbius. By the usual misunderstanding the horse thus killed would come in time to be regarded as an enemy offered up in sacrifice to the god whom he had injured' (*G.B.* ii. 315). The conjecture that a horse may have been thus annually sacrificed at Nemi as a representative of the deity of the grove is supported, or at least illustrated, by an account of the October horse.

A discussion of various sacramental customs leads up to an elucidation of the proverb *multi Mani Ariciae* (*G.B.* ii. 343 f.). The tradition that the founder of the grove was a man named Manius, from whom many Manii were descended, is dismissed as an etymological myth devised to explain the word *manias*. *Manias* were loaves shaped like men and, if we accept Dr. Frazer's ingenious emendation of a corrupt passage in Festus,<sup>1</sup> were especially made at Aricia. *Mania* was also the Mother or Grandmother of Ghosts, propitiated at the Compitalia. Hence Dr. Frazer suggests that 'in the old days, when the divine King of the Wood was annually slain, loaves were made in his image...and were eaten sacramentally by his worshippers.' 'A dim recollection of the original connexion of these loaves with human sacrifices may perhaps be traced in the story that the effigies

<sup>1</sup> Fest. p. 145 Müller 'et Ariciae genus panni fieri; quod manici appellatur.'

dedicated to Mania at the Compitalia were substitutes for human victims.'

But these are details. The main argument of chapter iii., so far as it bears upon Nemi, is that the *rex Nemorensis* was slain as a representative of the tree-spirit. The objection that such a custom has no analogy in classical antiquity is met by a section on Greek scape-goats and another on the Italian Saturnalia. Dr. Frazer holds that the *φάρμακοί* of Asia Minor, Athens, etc. were 'treated as divine' (*G.B.* iii. 134); and that the mock king of the Saturnalia originally represented Saturn himself and was put to death as the human embodiment of that deity (*G.B.* iii. 140 ff.).

(2) Having disposed of the first question, Why had the Arician priest to slay his predecessor? Dr. Frazer proceeds in chapter iv. to answer the second, Why, before doing so, had he to pluck the Golden Bough? Relying on Servius *ad Verg. Aen.* 6. 136 Dr. Frazer has already identified the branch to be broken from the sacred tree at Nemi with the golden bough mentioned by Virgil. A fresh consideration of *Verg. Aen.* 6. 136 ff., 203 ff., now leads him to infer that the tree was an oak and that the golden bough was mistletoe. If so, it follows from what has been said in chapter iii. that the King of the Wood must have been a personification of the oak-spirit. This permits of a comparison with the Norse god Balder, whom Dr. Frazer regards as a tree-spirit, probably the spirit of the oak, with an 'external soul' residing in the mistletoe (*G.B.* iii. 350). The myth of Balder enables us to understand why the King of the Wood could not be slain till the Golden Bough, *i.e.* the mistletoe, had been plucked. 'As an oak-spirit, his life or death was in the mistletoe on the oak, and so long as the mistletoe remained intact, he, like Balder, could not die. To slay him, therefore, it was necessary to break the mistletoe, and probably, as in the case of Balder, to throw it at him. And to complete the parallel, it is only necessary to suppose that the King of the Wood was formerly burned, dead or alive, at the midsummer fire festival which, as we have seen, was annually celebrated in the Arician grove. The perpetual fire which burned in the grove, like the perpetual fire under the oak at Romove, was probably fed with the sacred oak-wood; and thus it would be in a great fire of oak that the King of the Wood formerly met his end' (*G.B.* iii. 450).

Dr. Frazer ends by explaining why the mistletoe with its green leaves and whitish-

yellow berries is called the Golden Bough (*G.B.* iii. 451 ff.). Here he leans on the analogy of the mythical fern-seed. Fern-seed is supposed to bloom like gold or fire on Midsummer eve and Christmas night, when it empowers its lucky possessor to detect gold hidden in the ground. 'Fern-seed, in fact, would seem to be an emanation of the sun's fire at the two turning-points of its course, the summer and winter solstices.' Mistletoe too is gathered at Midsummer as well as at Christmas, and is used by treasure-seekers for their divining-rods. We must not, however, at once conclude that mistletoe, like fern-seed, is an emanation of the sun's fire. Rather, the sun's fire is an emanation of it. For the ancient Aryan replenished the sun by means of bonfires kindled by the friction of oak-wood; which implies that he looked upon the oak, and (*a fortiori*) the mistletoe, as a sort of solar reservoir. Small wonder, then, that he spoke of the latter as fiery or golden. May he not also have called the former by some name of similar import? Dr. Frazer remarks not only that Virbius was by some identified with the sun, but also that Greeks and Italians alike designated their chief divinity 'the Bright or Shining One' (Zeus, Jove), and that at his most ancient shrines in both countries this god (*Ζεὺς ῥαῖος*, *Jupiter feretrius*) was actually represented by an oak. 'The result, then, of our inquiry is to make it probable that, down to the time of the Roman Empire and the beginning of our era, the primitive worship of the Aryans was maintained nearly in its original form in the sacred grove at Nemi, as in the oak woods of Gaul, of Prussia, and of Scandinavia; and that the King of the Wood lived and died as an incarnation of the supreme Aryan god, whose life was in the mistletoe or Golden Bough.'

In estimating the value of Dr. Frazer's view we must bear in mind that from first to last it is very largely hypothetical. It is a conjecture that the Arician priest 'was deemed a living incarnation of the tree-spirit' (*G.B.* i. 232). It is a conjecture based on this conjecture, that 'as such he would be credited with those miraculous powers of sending rain and sunshine' etc. (*G.B.* i. 232). It is a conjecture supported by this conjecture-on-a-conjecture, that 'therefore' he 'had to be killed in order that the divine spirit, incarnate in him, might be transferred in unabated vigour to his successor' (*G.B.* ii. 59). Propped on this in turn are yet other conjectures—that the rule of succession at Nemi 'was a

mitigation of an earlier custom of putting him to death at the end of a set period' (*G.B.* ii. 60), and that he was perhaps 'allowed a chance for his life by flight' (*G.B.* ii. 67). Again, it is a pure conjecture that Virbius was 'a deity of vegetation' (*G.B.* ii. 314). It is a conjecture in the second degree 'that the horses by which Virbius was said to have been slain were really embodiments of him' as such (*G.B.* ii. 314). It is a conjecture in the third degree that there was 'an annual exception' to the rule excluding horses from the Arician grove (*G.B.* ii. 315). It is a conjecture in the fourth degree 'that the sacred grove of Aricia...may have been the scene of a common harvest celebration,' at which this exceptional horse was sacrificed as 'the fructifying spirit both of the tree and of the corn' (*G.B.* ii. 318). Conjectural too is the suggestion that 'when the divine King of the Wood was annually slain, loaves were made in his image...and were eaten sacramentally by his worshippers' (*G.B.* ii. 343 f.). Another series of conjectures is concerned with the mistletoe. It is not certain that the branch at Nemi was Virgil's golden bough. It is not certain that Virgil's golden bough was the mistletoe. Therefore it is doubly uncertain that the branch at Nemi was the mistletoe. Nor have we a right to assume that the tree at Nemi was an oak: for the only evidence that it was an oak is the doubtful identification of the branch at Nemi with Virgil's golden bough, which grew on an oak. Thus it needs a combination of assumptions to hold that Virbius was 'the spirit of the oak on which grew the Golden Bough' (*G.B.* iii. 456) and that 'the King of the Wood must have been a personification of the oak-spirit' (*G.B.* iii. 450). Equally conjectural or more so are the suggestions (*G.B.* iii. 450), that in the mistletoe was contained the external life of the King, that his successor could not slay him without breaking it first and 'probably' throwing it at him, that he 'was formerly burned, dead or alive, at the midsummer fire festival,' that the perpetual fire in the Arician grove 'was probably fed with the sacred oak-wood,' and that the fire in which the King may be supposed to have been burned was 'a great fire of oak.' Finally, it is a conjecture as precarious as any, that the chief deity of the Greeks and Italians was none other than the oak, and that he derived his name 'the Bright or Shining One' from the fact that on certain occasions fires of oak-wood were kindled to replenish by

magical means the flaming sun (*G.B.* iii. 456 f.).

Dr. Frazer's theory is indeed almost wholly hypothetical. But of this in itself we ought not to complain. For, where the facts to build with are so few, we cannot be surprised if the fabric is largely composed of less solid materials. And since Dr. Frazer's restoration follows the pattern of many primitive structures, it is obviously possible that the reader may obtain from his hypotheses a very fair notion of the original. At the same time we are justified in insisting that a reconstruction of this sort will not be satisfactory, (1) if in any points it be inconsistent with itself, and (2) if it base important conclusions on assumptions that are improbable. I confess, I feel that Dr. Frazer is open to criticism on both these grounds, and that the two parts of his discussion suffer accordingly.

(1) Dr. Frazer believes that the Arician priest was the incarnation of a deity resident in an oak. But if we ask—of what deity?—we receive apparently inconsistent replies. (a) Where Dr. Frazer sums up his whole investigation he concludes 'that the King of the Wood lived and died as an incarnation of the supreme Aryan god' (*G.B.* iii. 457). On Italian soil this god was named Jupiter and 'the image of Jupiter on the Capitol at Rome seems to have been originally nothing but a natural oak-tree' (*G.B.* iii. 346). On Dr. Frazer's showing, therefore, the Arician priest ought to be an incarnation of Jupiter. But we look in vain for any trace of a connexion between Jupiter and the Arician grove. The nearest approach to it is an unfinished marble bust of Graeco-Roman work 'probably intended to represent Jupiter' (Wallis *Illustr. Cat.* no. 832), which was found in one of the shrines at Nemi.<sup>1</sup> While speaking of Jupiter, I must add that Dr. Frazer's rejection of the orthodox view ignores much of the available evidence. 'Zeus and Jupiter,' we are told (*G.B.* iii. 457 n. 1), 'have commonly been regarded as sky gods, because their names are etymologically connected with the Sanscrit word for sky. The reason seems insufficient.' Quite so: but it is strongly supported by such phrases as *ὁ δ' ἄρα Ζεὺς | πάννυχος*, *sub Iove frigido*, by such epithets as *ἀργικέρανος*, *ἐρίγδοντος*, *εὐρύσπα*, *κελαινεφής*, *νεφεληγερέτα*, *ὕψιβρεμέτης*,

<sup>1</sup> One wonders that Dr. Frazer did not press into his service the epithet *Dianus* applied to Jupiter in an inscription from Aquileia: *C.I.L.* v. 783 *Iovi Dianō* etc. See Birt in Roscher *Lex.* i. 1003, 49 ff.

*ὕψιζυγος*, by such cult titles as *Ἀστραπαῖος*, *Βροντῶν*, *Εὐάνεμος*, *Ἰκμαῖος*, *Κεραύνιος*, *Ναῖος*, *Ὀμβριος*, *Οὔριος*, *Υἱέριος*, by such attributes as the thunderbolt, and by a host of other considerations.

(b) Elsewhere it is Virbius, not Jupiter, who is described as 'the spirit of the oak on which grew the Golden Bough' (*G.B.* iii. 456). That Virbius was 'a deity of vegetation' (*G.B.* ii. 314) at all is, I have said, a pure conjecture devised to account for 'the tradition that Virbius, the first of the divine Kings of the Wood at Aricia, was killed by horses' (*G.B.* ii. 313), for 'the custom of excluding horses from his sacred grove' (*G.B.* ii. 314), and for the fact that 'Virbius came to be confounded with the sun' (*G.B.* i. 6, 231, iii. 456). Prof. Wissowa with equal confidence propounds the view that Virbius was 'wahrscheinlich ein bei der Entbindung hilfreicher Dämon' (*op. cit.* p. 200). Sauer in Roscher *Lex.* i. 2684, following Buttmann *Mythologus* ii. 151 ff., states that Virbius 'als Heilgott und als reiferer Mann dem Asklepios wesensverwandt ist' and conjectures that Hippolytus, like Asklepios, the son of the sun-god Apollo, was originally 'die heilkräftige Sonne.' If it comes to guessing, why not identify Virbius with the stream that flowed through the wood at Nemi? Vib. Sequ. p. 20, 5 Oberl. has the following entry under the head of *flumina*: 'Virbius Laconices, ubi Hippolytum Aesculapius arte medicinae reddidit vitae, unde et Virbius dictus.' Vibius, who wrote circ. 400 A.D., was concerned to give an alphabetical list of the localities mentioned by the most popular poets: his usual sources are Virgil, Ovid *met.* and *fast.*, Lucan (Teuffel-Schwabe § 445, 1). It seems to me probable, therefore, that he had in mind Ov. *fast.* 6. 737 ff., where Aesculapius undertakes to restore Hippolytus to life (*vitam sine volnere reddam, | et cedent arti tristia fata meae*). If so, Vibius' note may well be based on Ov. *ib.* 756 '*Aricino Virbius ille lacu*'; in which case we should correct the text to 'Virbius lacu Aricino,'<sup>2</sup> ubi Hippolytum' etc. The corruption into *Laconices* would be easy, since eight lines before stands '*Taygeta Laconices, ubi*' etc. Confusion is one stage more confounded in a second entry under *fontes*: p. 22, 15 Oberl. 'Virvinus Laconices.' That Vibius was acquainted with the Lake of Nemi appears from his *lacus* p. 24, 11 Oberl. '*Triviae lacus Ariciae*.' So then this geographer at least took Virbius to be

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Postgate suggests *lacu Ariciae*.



the name of a stream, in all probability the stream at Nemi; for a river Virbius in Laconia passes belief, and I have shown how the error may have arisen. Of course Vibius Sequester may have blundered: he blunders elsewhere. But let us assume for the moment that Virbius really was the stream at Nemi. The stream-god would naturally be associated with Diana, who was worshipped on his banks (cp. Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 5. 95 'singula enim numina habent inferiores potestates ministras: ut, Venus Adonim, Diana Virbium,' *id. ib.* 7. 84, 761). When Diana was identified with Artemis, the associate of the former would be identified with the associate of the latter,—Virbius would be regarded as a re-incarnation of Hippolytus. Hippolytus met his fate when driving his team of horses; and this myth was, we know, quoted to explain why horses were not allowed to stray into Diana's *abaton* at Nemi.<sup>1</sup> Lastly, horses were sacrificed by the ancients on the one hand to water-spirits (see Roscher *Lex.* i. 1495, 49 ff., Frazer *Pausanias* iv. 197 f.), on the other hand to the sun (Hdt. 1. 216, Paus. iii. 20. 4, Philostr. *her.* 10. 2)—which would be quite enough to connect a river-god Virbius with the sun. If this possibility be granted, we obtain perhaps an explanation of the marble *stele* with a double bust of aquatic divinities discovered in the precinct at Nemi. It is figured by Mr. G. H. Wallis *Illustr. Cat.* No. 611 and thus described. It 'consists of the head of a beardless young man, and of an elderly man with a flowing beard. Both have on their foreheads fishes' fins, looking like small wings, aquatic plants cover the neck and chest, and scales cover the cheeks of both heads; the head of the young man has a small fin at each angle of the mouth, the beard of the elder head seems saturated with water and the long damp hair of both heads seems to be blown about in the wind. To judge from the decorative style of sculpture, these heads, which are full of character, are the work of the early Imperial Epoch. The *stele* is inscribed SACR DIAN'. Have we here the double form of Diana's favourite, Hippolytus-Virbius? In *Ov. met.* 15. 539 f. he tells how the goddess 'addidit aetatem nec cognoscenda reliquit | ora mihi.' This would suit the union of a youthful with an elderly

head and the curious treatment of the faces.<sup>2</sup> But, whatever may be thought of the identification,<sup>3</sup> it is at least as probable that Virbius was a river-god as that he was a tree-spirit: for we have it on the (rather questionable) authority of a geographer that there was a river called Virbius, whereas the arboreal character of this puzzling personage is a matter of mere conjecture. Besides, if the *rex Nemorensis* was really the incarnating priest of Virbius, why should there have been a distinct 'flamen Virbialis' (*G.B.* i. 6, Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 200, n. 4)? It is singular indeed that a priest of Diana should be found incarnating Virbius, while the priest of Virbius had no such part to play.

(c) Earlier in his book Dr. Frazer had implied that the immanent spirit was neither Jupiter nor Virbius, but Diana. For, after remarking (*G.B.* i. 230) that 'the attributes of Diana, the goddess of the Arician grove, are those of a tree-spirit or sylvan deity,' he continued (*G.B.* i. 231)—'May not then the King of the Wood in the Arician grove have been...an incarnation of the tree-spirit or spirit of vegetation?' To which the retort is obvious:<sup>4</sup> No, for an incarnation of Diana would presumably be a Queen, not a King.

If, then, we start by assuming that the *rex Nemorensis* was the human form of a tree-spirit, we are met by serious difficulties

<sup>2</sup> The fish forms are not inappropriate to a companion of Artemis. The *xoanon* of Artemis-Eurynome at Phigaleia had a fish tail (Paus. viii. 41. 6). An archaic jar from Thebes, now in the National Museum at Athens, shows a standing female figure with outstretched arms resembling flippers or wings and a robe adorned with a large fish: this peculiar being is probably the Boeotian *πόρνια θηρώων*, and as such would have affinities with Diana Nemorensis (see above). The fish of the fountain Arethusa were sacred to Artemis (Diod. Sic. 5. 3), whose head appears on a Syracusan coin surrounded by fish (Dar.-SagI. ii. 135, n. 120). In *Anth. Pal.* vi. 105 a fisherman offers a mullet to Artemis *Ἀρτεμίδι* (cp. Cornut. *N.D.* 34, p. 233). Aphaia, the Aeginetan goddess identified with Artemis (Hesych. s.v. *Ἀφαία*), was brought from Crete to Aegina by a fisherman (Anton. Lib. 40). Diktyнна, her prototype in western Crete, was also the divinity of fisher-folk (see Roscher *Lex.* i. 825, 23 ff., Farnell *Cults of the Gr. States* ii. 476 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Mr. G. H. Wallis *Illustr. Cat.* p. 33 regards the herm 'as personification of the lakes of Albano and Nemi.'

<sup>4</sup> So Mr. Andrew Lang *Magic and Religion* p. 210: 'Given a female tree-spirit, we should rather expect a Queen of the Wood.' In Sen. *Phaedr.* 414 'regina nemorum' is Diana herself. When we recall the theme of Seneca's play and its connexion with the legend of Aricia, it seems possible that the phrase 'regina nemorum' was consciously or unconsciously suggested by the title 'rex Nemorensis.'

<sup>1</sup> Verg. *Aen.* 7. 778 ff. and *Ov. fasti* 3. 263 ff. 'vallis Aricinae silva praecinctus opaca | est lacus, antiqua religione sacer. | hic latet Hippolytus furis direptus equorum, | unde nemus nullis illud aditur equis.'

whichever way we turn. It might seem at first sight as though a way out of them could be found by the further assumption that Diana was not the first tenant of the Arician grove, but that her cult had been superimposed by the Latins on that of an aboriginal wood-god. This would plausibly account for the fact that in later times the Arician priest was regularly a slave. The god of the conquered population, hypothetically reduced to slavery, would fitly be served by a slave. Note too that Aug. 13, the date of Diana's festival at Rome, was a *servorum dies* (Wissowa, *op. cit.* p. 201), that Servius Tullius who founded the temple on the Aventine was according to the story of servile origin, and that the Manii of Aricia might by a little ingenuity be explained as slaves (cp. Μανῆς, Μανία, and Petron. 45 iam Manios aliquot habet). But unfortunately for such a hypothesis the evidence all goes to show that Diana had been the deity worshipped at Nemi from time immemorial (*G.B.* i. 2 n. 1). There is not a particle of proof that Diana at Nemi was, like Apollo at Delphi, a comparatively late comer. And Dr. Frazer probably does well to refrain from any attempt to make his escape in that direction. He would, I venture to think, have done better still, had he refrained from assuming that the *rex Nemorensis* was the incarnation of any divinity at all.

(2) Another assumption that has made mischief in Dr. Frazer's mind is that the branch at Nemi was mistletoe and the tree an oak. The basis of this assumption is Servius' note on Verg. *Aen.* 6. 136, which—as it is important to the argument—I transcribe below.<sup>1</sup> Servius here records a

<sup>1</sup> Serv. in *Aen.* 6. 136 Thilo *latet arbore opaca aureus* licet de hoc ramo hi qui de sacris Proserpinae scripsisse dicuntur, quiddam esse mysticum adfirmant, publica tamen opinio hoc habet. Orestes post occisum regem Thoantem in regione Taurica cum sorore Iphigenia, ut supra <ii 116> diximus, fugit et Dianae simulacrum inde sublatum haud longe ab Aricia collocavit. in huius templo post mutatum ritum sacrificiorum fuit arbor quaedam, de qua infringi ramum non licebat. dabatur autem fugitivis potestas, ut si quis exinde ramum potuisset auferre, monomachia cum fugitivo templi sacerdote dimicaret: nam fugitivus illic erat sacerdos ad priscae imaginem fugae. dimicandi autem dabatur facultas quasi ad pristini sacrificii reparationem. nunc ergo istum inde sumpsit colorem, ramus enim necesse erat ut et unius causa esset interitus: unde et statim mortem subiungit Miseni: et ad sacra Proserpinae accedere nisi sublato ramo non poterat. inferos autem subire hoc dicit, sacra celebrare Proserpinae. de reditu autem animae hoc est: novimus Pythagoram Samium vitam humanam divisisse in modum Y litterae, scilicet quod prima aetas incerta sit, quippe quae adhuc se nec vitii nec

whole series of comments and explanations that had been offered by others with regard to the Virgilian incident of the Golden Bough.

(i) 'Public opinion' connected it with the following tale. Orestes, having killed Thoas king of Taurica, fled with Iphigenia to Italy and established the statue of Diana, which he had carried off, not far from Aricia—presumably at Nemi. 'After the rite of sacrifice had been changed,' i.e. when the translated Diana had become a reformed character, who no longer demanded human victims, there still grew in her sacred precinct a certain tree, from which in ordinary circumstances it was not lawful to break a branch. But, if a runaway slave could manage to do so, he might challenge the priest of the temple, himself a runaway slave, to a duel. The priest was a runaway slave in memory of Orestes' legendary flight. The duel in a sense made up to the goddess for the old human sacrifices that she missed. All this, as Mr. Andrew Lang has observed (*The Fortnightly Review* 1901 p. 236 = *Magic and Religion* p. 209), is a good example of an aetiological myth. Orestes and the Tauric Artemis were brought in to explain certain features in the primitive cult of Diana Nemorensis. But, whatever may be said for or against the parallel between Taurica and Nemi, one thing at least it does not explain, and that is the Golden Bough. Servius implies (he does not directly state it) that 'public opinion' identified the golden bough plucked by Aeneas with the bough plucked by the would-be *rex* at Aricia. But this identification, as Mr. Lang remarks, is dubious in the extreme. For the bough of Aeneas was definitely and distinctively golden, whereas we are not told that such was the case with the bough at Nemi: indeed Servius' words (*arbor quaedam de qua infringi ramum non licebat*) would naturally be taken to refer to any bough of the tree, as though all its boughs were of equal worth. The dedication of the Virgilian bough to 'Iuno inferna,' its supernatural toughness in unhallowed hands, its willingness to go with the man ordained

virtutibus dedit: bivium autem Y litterae a inventute incipere, quo tempore homines aut vitia, id est partem sinistram, aut virtutes, id est dexteram partem sequuntur: unde ait Persius <v 35> *traducit trepidas ramosa in compita mentes*. ergo per ramum virtutes dicit esse sectandas, qui est Y litterae imitatio: quem ideo in silvis dicit latere, quia re vera in huius vitae confusione et maiore parte vitiorum virtus et integritas latet. alii dicunt ideo ramo aureo inferos peti, quod divitiis facile mortales intereunt. Tiberianus *aureum*, quo pretio *reservantur limina Ditis*.

by fate, are all important characteristics which, so far as we know, have nothing whatever to correspond to them at Nemi. It is clear, then, that, if 'public opinion' explained the Golden Bough by means of the Arician tree, it was founding its explanation on a very questionable analogy. And Dr. Frazer is building on sand when he assumes, as he does throughout his book, the trustworthiness of that explanation.

(ii) But Servius has another view of the matter, this time literary, not traditional. Dr. Frazer does not, I think, mention it; but it deserves a passing notice. 'Those who are said to have written about the rites of Proserpina' held that there was 'something mystic' about the Golden Bough and brought it into connexion with the ordinary ritual of Proserpina. Their explanation was as follows. Aeneas was about to enter the Underworld. His entry was tantamount to an initiation into Proserpina's rites. None might draw near to those rites without bearing a branch. Hence Virgil had to provide Aeneas with a branch. The reference to branch-bearing in the rites of Proserpina is sufficiently explained by what M. Lenormant says of the Eleusinian initiates (Dar.-Sagl. ii. 570): 'Les mystes s'y présentaient couronnés de myrte et tenant à la main un bâton de forme particulière, sorte de thyrses très courts. . . Ce pouvait être aussi un simple rameau, et c'est ainsi que sur le célèbre vase à reliefs de Cumes (fig. 2639) Céléus ou Eubouleus porte, en guise de *bacchos*, un rameau d'arbre.' But that Virgil had the Eleusinian rite in view is not very likely: we have no reason to believe that the Eleusinian branches were golden, or that they were taken from the *ilex* (Aen. 6. 209), or that they corresponded in any other way to the Virgilian branch. However, this second view contains at least a germ of truth. Virgil's branch was 'Iuoni infernae dictus sacer' (Aen. 6. 138) and the Sibyl said of it (*ib.* 142 f.)—'hoc sibi pulchra suum ferri Proserpina munus | instituit.' In short, its chthonian character is well established. But can we go further? I think we can, thanks to Servius' garrulity: he has other *ἐνδοξα* in store.

(iii) A marginal gloss in cod. T says: 'quidam accipiunt ramum pro scientia mistice et aureum pro claritate sapientiae et sic quisque inferos ingreditur id est secreta scientiae perscrutatur.' This allegorical interpretation of the Golden Bough is set out at greater length by Servius himself. Pythagoras took the letter Y as an object lesson in ethics, its 'ramosa compita' indicating

respectively virtue and vice. Virgil's 'ramus' hidden in the wood is a similar parable of human life, where true teaching is often overlaid by a tangle of error. (iv) Others, adds Servius, say that the Bough is Golden because mortals meet their death through riches—witness the poet Tiberianus, who wrote on the pernicious effects of gold and began his poem thus (Bährens *unedierte lat. Gedichte* Lps. 1877 = *P.L.M.* iii. 265):

Aurum, quod nigri manes, quod turbida  
uersant  
flumina, quod duris extorsit poena metallis!  
Aurum, quo pretio reserantur limina Ditis,  
quo Stygii regina poli Proserpina gaudet!

and towards the close of it wrote:

Te celent semper uada turbida, te luta  
nigra,  
te tellus mersum premat infera, te sibi  
nasci  
Tartareus cupiat Phlegethon Stygiaeque  
paludes!

Now it is possible that comments iii and iv, though they obviously explain nothing about the Arician cult, may help to throw some light on the equally obscure subject of Virgil's Golden Bough. Its chthonian character is, we have seen, certain; and the whole Virgilian episode shows that it was a kind of passport to the Underworld. But why a bough? and why golden? and why compared to the mistletoe? Because divining-rods were used for the discovery of treasure and might be of mistletoe. Prof. E. B. Tylor (*Man.* 1902, p. 49 f. no. 40) shows that 'the European divining rod was used to find not only water but mineral veins, stolen treasure, and even the thief who stole it.' And Dr. Frazer (*G.B.* iii. 454) mentions 'divining-rods of mistletoe' used in Sweden by treasure-seekers. Aeneas before entering the realm of *Πλούτων* might well be furnished with such a rod: it would enable him 'telluris operta subire,' and its power of self-movement is perhaps hinted at in the words 'ipse volens facilisque sequetur.' One further point: the usual shape of the divining rod is that of the letter Y. Now Prof. J. Burnet (*Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 84 ff.) has proved 'the close relation between Pythagorean and savage modes of thought' (*ib.* p. 105). Is it not possible that the importance attached to the letter Y was due to one of Pythagoras' 'primitive usages' (*ib.* p. 84)? I mean, he as a 'wonder-worker' (*ib.* p. 90) and a 'medicine-man' (*ib.* p. 91), who was identified with Apollo

Hyperboreios the god of divination (Aristot. *frag.* 186)<sup>1</sup>, used a divining fork and expounded its virtues in allegorical fashion: the famous Y is but the symbol of his fork.<sup>2</sup> However that may be, I do not doubt that Virgil's Golden Bough is the mythical counterpart of the dowser's mistletoe rod used for the discovery of underground secrets. It is intelligible on its own merits; and we do but darken counsel if we try to connect it with Nemi. To support weighty conclusions on that fancied connexion is indeed a perilous procedure.

Dr. Frazer in his second Preface (p. xv.) refers to hypotheses as 'necessary but often temporary bridges built to connect isolated facts.' This particular bridge must, I fear, be abandoned as unsound. But if so, what have we to offer in its stead? Is there no ascertainable link between the Arician priesthood and the rest of Italian religion? I believe that there is, and that it is a good deal simpler than Dr. Frazer supposes. We need not go so far afield as 'the mouth of the Congo' (*G.B.* i. 163) or 'the backwoods of Cambodia' (*G.B.* i. 164) to find a parallel to the *rex Nemorensis*. Not twenty miles away, along the Appian Road, lived another priestly king, the *rex sacrorum* of Rome. And it will be at least worth while to enquire whether the known facts with regard to the latter may not provide us with a satisfactory explanation of the former.

I begin by noting that in connexion with both these priestly kings was a cult of Vesta. At Nemi Diana herself bore the title Vesta (inscr. Orelli 1455 = Wilmanns 1767), and Dr. Frazer observes (*G.B.* i. 5) that this 'points almost certainly to the maintenance of a perpetual holy fire in her sanctuary.' He might also have observed that Lord Savile discovered the base of a small circular shrine at the back of her temple. And none know better than Dr. Frazer what that circular form signifies. His brilliant essay in the *J. of Ph.* xiv. 145 ff. proved conclusively that

<sup>1</sup> In proof of his claim to be Apollo he exhibited his golden thigh and took from Abaris *ἄνελχε χρυσοῦν οἰστόν, ὃν ἔνευ οὐχ ὁλός τ' ἦν τὰς ἀδούς ἐξυπλάκειν* (Iamb. *vit. Pyth.* 140 f.). The golden arrow which showed the way can hardly be other than the arrow with which Apollo is represented as divining on the coins of Syria (e.g. *Head Coins of the Ancients*, pl. 38). At Ixiai in Rhodes Apollo was worshipped as Ἰξίαιος: the place itself was so called ἀπὸ Ἰξοῦ (Steph. *Byz.* s.v. Ἰξίαι), and the title of the god may have some relation to his character as a diviner.

<sup>2</sup> Since writing the above I find that Miss A. W. Buckland, *Anthropological Studies*, p. 146, cites from Tyndale's *Sardinia* the suggestion that the Pythagorean Y 'might perhaps also be considered an analogous character' to 'the bifurcated stick.'

the primitive circular hut with a hearth inside was perpetuated in the circular temples of Vesta. In short, this circular base must be the stylobate of Vesta's hearth.<sup>3</sup> Further, among the terracotta figures found in the precinct at Nemi was one that is catalogued as 'Head of a Vestal Virgin' (*Illustr. Cat.* no. 600). Undeniably, then, there was at Nemi a cult of Vesta in close connexion with the grove over which the sacerdotal king kept guard. At Rome too the Vestal Virgins were intimately associated with the *rex sacrorum*—an association on which Dr. Frazer in the aforesaid essay and Mr. Warde Fowler in his *Roman Festivals* (pp. 213, 282, 288, 334) justly lay stress. Moreover, Servius in commenting on Verg. *Aen.* 10. 228 says: 'virgines Vestales certa die ibant ad regem sacrorum et dicebant: *vigilansne rex? vigila.*' So that the priestly king at Rome, as at Aricia, had a sacred vigil to keep. Similarly on Greek soil the βασιλεύς stood in a special relation to the κοινὴ ἱερία, as is clear from the evidence collected by Dr. Frazer *loc. cit.* p. 146, n. 5, by G. Gilbert *Griech. Staatsalterth.* ii. 271 n. 2, 324 n. 1 and by v. Schoeffer in Pauly-Wissowa s.v. 'Basileus.'<sup>4</sup> In some parts of the world analogous practices are still observed. To the cases cited by Dr. Frazer *ib.* p. 159 ff. add one more. The Rev. J. Roscoe informs me that 'the temporal king of Uganda is at the same time the head of all the priests in the country. He is also the guardian of a sacred fire, which is kept burning at the main entrance to the royal enclosure. When the king travels, the fire goes with him. When the king dies, the fire is extinguished.'<sup>5</sup> It would appear, then, that the connexion between a priestly king and a sacred hearth

<sup>3</sup> Lord Savile himself oddly took it to be 'a circular sacrificial altar, with a gutter for carrying away the blood' (*Illustr. Cat.*, p. 9). But the base (of which a photo-mezzotype is given *ib.* p. 10) is obviously a stylobate, consisting of three concentric steps and 'showing traces of having been paved in mosaic.' The gutter is nothing more gruesome than a rain-water drain. The position of the supposed altar, 'at the N.E. angle of the rear of the Temple, and not in front of it' (*ib.* p. 9) would alone suffice to prove that it was not, as the excavators imagined, 'the external altar of the Artemision.'

<sup>4</sup> Aristotle *Pol.* H (Z) 8. 1322b 28 mentions certain magistrates who ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἱερίας ἔχουσι τὴν τιμὴν καλοῦσι δὲ οἱ μὲν ἄρχοντας τούτους οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις. This is best illustrated by an inscription from Mytilene: *Cauer*<sup>2</sup> 431, 45 ff. τὰς δ' ἀναγγελίας τῶν στεφάνων (ὅπως γέ)νηται, ἐπιμελήσθην τοῖς βασιλεῦσι καὶ πρυτάνεσι, καλέσαι δὲ ἐπὶ (ἐξ) ἑνὶ τοῖς δικασταῖς καὶ τῶν γραμματέων ἐς τὸ πρυτανήιον ἐπὶ τὰν κοινὰν ἱερ(ί)αν.

<sup>5</sup> See also the Rev. J. Roscoe, *Further Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda*, p. 51.



traceable both at Nemi and at Rome, belongs to that primitive state of society in which the king as head of the household with the help of his unmarried daughters watches over the family fire. This encourages us to believe that the known origin of the *rex sacrorum* may serve to elucidate the unknown origin of the *rex Nemorensis*. The *rex sacrorum*, as is well known, discharged those sacerdotal functions that the king of Rome had to the last retained in his hands; he was the religious ghost of the former monarch. Assume that the same is true of the *rex Nemorensis*, and much of the mystery that surrounds him will vanish. He was at one time the dictator of a league of Latin communities, whose religious centre was Aricia. As such he had under his especial charge the Arician cult, the cult of Diana. When the Latin league that he

represented ceased to have political importance, its *rex* survived as a religious functionary, precisely as did the *rex sacrorum* at Rome or the βασιλεύς and the φιλοβασιλῆς at Athens.

Looked at from this point of view, the various problems concerned with him cease to present any serious difficulty. (a) 'A candidate for the priesthood,' says Dr. Frazer (*G.B.* (i.2) 'could only succeed to office by slaying the priest, and having slain him, he retained office till he was himself slain by a stronger or a craftier.' This rule of succession has been rightly explained by Mr. Andrew Lang as 'a mere rude form of superannuation' (*Magic and Religion*, pp. 94-100, 216). Whenever the infirmities of age began to increase upon the *rex*, he was no longer fit to act as *Fidei Defensor* and must therefore make way for a more vigorous successor.



MARBLE FRAGMENTS FROM THE PRECINCT AT NEMI.  
(Parts of gnarled tree-trunks, one attached to portion of human figure.)

But, since he might deny his unfitness or conceal the signs of incipient old age, primitive justice demanded that he should hold himself ready to meet in single combat all who challenged him. If he repelled their attack, well and good; he had proved himself the better man. If he were worsted, again well and good; the better man took his place. Dr. Frazer himself cites many examples of kings who are killed or are forced to kill themselves as soon as they contract any bodily defects (*G.B.* ii. 5-13), others in which all danger of royal senility is averted by fixing a limit to the king's reign (*G.B.* ii. 14), and one which furnishes a parallel to the Arician challenge (*G.B.* ii. 14 f.). But, as Mr. Andrew Lang insists, none of these kings is shown to be an embodiment of a divinity. Hence the *monomachia* of Nemi can be satisfactorily explained as an early form

of superannuation without recourse to any doctrine of incarnate gods.<sup>1</sup>

(b) Again, the *rex Nemorensis* had to mount guard over a particular tree in the grove of Diana,—probably because Diana herself was thought to reside in the tree. Diana was normally worshipped in a *lucus* (Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 199, n. 1 and p. 401), indeed every *lucus* was her sanctuary (Serv.

<sup>1</sup> In the honour attaching to the *spolia opima* we may perhaps trace another relic of the same principle. Romulus, when he had slain the king of the Caeninenses with his own hand in battle, deposited his spoils 'ad quercum pastoribus sacram' and there marked out the bounds of a temple to Jupiter Feretrius (Liv. i. 10. 5). The circumstances suggest comparison with Nemi. A further vestige of the same barbaric custom may, as Dr. Frazer surmises (*G.B.* ii. 67), underlie the annual *regifugium* at Rome (Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverw.* iii.<sup>2</sup> 323 f.); though again there is no need to assume any inherent divinity in the *rex*.

on Verg. *georg.* 3. 332, quoted by Frazer *G.B.* i. 230, n. 1). But she may have been especially connected with one sacred tree, just as Artemis Κεῖφαρης had a wooden image in a great cedar at Orchomenos (Paus. viii. 13. 2).<sup>1</sup> If this was so at Nemi, it might serve to explain the two marble fragments found in the course of the excavations 'representing a tree attached to a statue' (*Illustr. Cat.*, no. 790).<sup>2</sup> What more reasonable than that a religious *rex*, the successor of a temporal *dictator*, should be expected to keep watch and ward over the very home of the goddess?

(c) But why should the Arician *rex* be a runaway slave, whereas the Roman *rex* was always a patrician? The discrepancy is perhaps to be accounted for by the peculiar terms of succession that obtained at Nemi. In primitive times the obligation to fight all comers would not be considered much of a drawback: consequently the office was held by distinguished persons. 'Legend had it that...Diana, for the love she bore Hippolytus, carried him away to Italy...where he reigned a forest king under the name of Virbius' (*G.B.* i. 6). History had it that Egerius Laevius the Latin dictator, or according to others Manius Egerius, dedicated the grove to Diana. This latter version suggests an explanation of the proverb *multi Mani Ariciae*, which on the face of it referred to an old and famous pedigree but was sometimes connected with *Mania*, a 'bugbear to frighten children' (*G.B.* i. 6). If we suppose that the Manii of Aricia were the old kingly dynasty of the place, this curious change of meaning becomes intelligible.<sup>3</sup> The temporal *rex*, recognised head of the Latin league, was a personage of distinction: the religious *rex*, who 'at any time of the day, and probably far into the night' (*G.B.* i. 2) prowled about the sacred grove, sword in hand, might well be taken as a bogey-man. One thing at least is clear: it cannot be shown that in early days any servile character attached to the *regnum*.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Postgate reminds me of Stat. *Theb.* 4. 425 ff. 'nec caret umbra deo; nemori Latonia cultris | additur. hanc piecae cedrique et robore in omni | effectam sanctis occultat silva tenebris.'

<sup>2</sup> Mr. G. H. Wallis kindly supplied me with the photograph from which the above illustration of these fragments was made.

<sup>3</sup> The 'Manius heres' of Pers. 6. 56 is, as Conington says, 'one of the aristocracy of Aricia'—a beggar. Persius probably chose this phrase deliberately to suit its context, the passage about pedigrees. Manius was a name which had come down in the world: it was common in the gens Aemilia and the gens Sergia (Egbert *Lat. Inscr.* p. 85), but had come to be used even of slaves (Cato *de re rust.* 141).

But, as time went on and Latin society gradually emerged from its barbaric condition, a kingship with no temporal power and tenable on these precarious terms became less and less sought after. At last only men 'tam abiectae condicionis tamque extremae sortis' (Suet. *Cal.* 35) could be found willing to take their lives in their hands and become candidates for the post. The restriction to runaway slaves may have been helped out by a popular play on words. Runaway slaves were called with grim humour *cervi*, not *servi*; and Diana, who had under her protection the stags of the woodland, would also shelter the human quarry in her sanctuary: cp. Festus p. 343 Müller 'servorum dies festus vulgo existimatur Idus Aug., quod eo die Ser. Tullius, natus servus, aedem Dianae dedicaverit in Aventino, cuius tutelae sint cervi, a quo celeritate fugitivos vocent cervos.' Similarly any man who entered the grove of Zeus Lukaïos in Arcadia was dubbed Λαφος (Plut. *quaest. Gr.* 39), perhaps as being the natural prey of the fierce wolf-god (see *J.H.S.* xiv. 137). However that may be, the deterrent effect of the sword-of-Damocles at Nemi is illustrated by the vacant throne of Ngoïo in West Africa (*G.B.* ii. 26). One can quite understand that none but a desperado would in imperial, or even late republican, times have become a claimant for the Arician kingship. On the other hand, the *rex sacrorum* at Rome had to submit to nothing more dangerous or degrading than the annual *regifugium* above mentioned; his office remained compatible with patrician dignity.

(d) Those who undertook the risk at Nemi had first to break off a bough from the sacred tree. Why? According to Dr. Frazer, because the life of the oak-spirit resided in the mistletoe; the incarnating priest could not, therefore, be slain until the mistletoe had been cut (*G.B.* iii. 450). According to Mr. Andrew Lang, 'the bough was broken...as a taunt, a challenge, and a warning. "You can't keep your old tree, make room for a better man!" That is the spirit of the business' (*Magic and Religion*, p. 221). I should prefer to steer a middle course between the subtlety of Dr. Frazer's explanation and the outspoken verve of Mr. Lang's. It is doubtful whether the tree was an oak<sup>4</sup> and still more doubtful whether

<sup>4</sup> Prof. Furtwängler *die antiken Gemmen* iii. 231 holds that we have a representation of Diana Nemorensis in a series of gems, which exhibit a draped female figure standing by an altar with a branch in one hand and a cup (sometimes full of

any mistletoe grew on it; but after all it was a sacred tree, and the branch—I take it—was broken in order that the challenger might put himself directly under the protection of Diana. The very fact that he had been able<sup>1</sup> to break off the branch raised a presumption that he was the chosen champion of the goddess, and—wearing her favour, so to speak,<sup>2</sup>—he did battle with the former champion.

If, then, we start from the simple hypothesis that the *rex Nemorensis* is comparable with the *rex sacrorum*, the various details of the Arician priesthood fall into place without difficulty and we arrive at a satisfactory theory of the whole cult. Indeed so obvious is the path that we ask in amazement, How came Dr. Frazer to miss it? The fact is, he did not miss it, but deliberately rejected it. In vol. i. p. 162 he raises the question 'May not the King of the Wood have had an origin like that which a probable tradition assigns to the Sacrificial King of Rome and the titular King of Athens? In other words, may not his predecessors in office have been a line of kings whom a republican revolution stripped of their political power, leaving them only their religious functions and the shadow of a crown?' 'There are,' Dr. Frazer continues, 'at least two reasons for answering this question in the negative. One reason is drawn from the abode of the priest of Nemi; the other from his title, the King of the Wood. If his predecessors had been kings in the ordinary sense, he would surely have been found residing, like the fallen kings of Rome and Athens, in the city of which the sceptre had passed from him. This city must have been Aricia, for there was none nearer. But Aricia, as we have seen, was three miles off from his forest sanctuary by the lake shore. If he reigned, it was not in the city, but in the greenwood. Again his title, King of the Wood, hardly allows us to suppose that he had ever been a king in the common sense of the word. More likely he was a king of nature, and of a special side of nature, namely, the woods from which he took his title.'

fruit) in the other; near her is placed a stag (*ib.* pl. xx. 66, xxii. 18, 26, 30, 32). A similarly posed male figure holding a sacrificial knife (*ib.* pl. xxii. 19) is regarded by him as Virbius. If these identifications were certain, we could be sure that the sacred tree at Nemi was *not* an oak: for in pl. xxii. 18 at least the branch has round fruit on it, probably apples.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Serv. on *Aen.* 6. 136 'dabatur autem fugitivis potestas, ut si quis exinde ramum potuisset auferre,' etc.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. the *βαλλοφόροι* at the Panathenaic festival.

These two objections are the lions that frightened Dr. Frazer from finding his way to the Interpreter's house. But closer inspection shows that the lions are chained.

(1) If, argues Dr. Frazer, the *rex Nemorensis* had been in truth the religious successor of a line of temporal monarchs, he would have been found residing where his predecessors resided—at Aricia. As it is, we find him three miles off in a forest sanctuary. Therefore he had no such secular origin. This argument strikes me as a singularly weak one. It assumes as beyond question that an Arician monarch would reside at Aricia. But, if an important part of the duties of an early *rex* was to look after the public ritual of his domain (Dr. Frazer has just proved it: *G.B.* i. 161 f.), and if the chief cult of Aricia went on at Nemi (Dr. Frazer would readily admit it: *G.B.* i. 2), why in the name of all that is reasonable should not the Arician king have lived at Nemi? That he actually did so is rendered highly probable, if not absolutely certain, by the associated cult of Vesta. What is the meaning of a Vesta-shrine, *alias* a public hearth, at Nemi except that the king had his residence there? Aricia was not unique in having its principal religious seat at a distance from the town: the Artemision at Ephesus, for example, was almost a mile from the city,<sup>3</sup> and its sacred kings the Essenes<sup>4</sup> very probably resided within the *temenos*. Religious obligations, then, provide a sufficient reason for the choice of the Arician king's abode. (2) Again, Dr. Frazer urges: 'his title, King of the Wood, hardly allows us to suppose that he had ever been a king in the common sense of the word.' This argument is misleading. The English phrase 'King of the Wood' does more or less suggest a departmental king of nature; but only because we do not use the word 'wood' as a separate place-name: 'King of the Black Forest' or 'King of the Bush' would not be similarly suggestive. Now the Latin phrase *rex Nemorensis* means, not 'king of *nemora* in general,' but 'king of the *Nemus* in parti-

<sup>3</sup> J. T. Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Elym. mag.* 383, 30 'Ἐσσηνὶ δὲ βασιλεὺς κατὰ Ἐφεσίου. See *J.H.S.* xv. 12 and Herwerden *Lex. Gr. suppl.*, s.v. Ἐσσην. Strabo xiv. 1. 3 (633c) states on the authority of Pherekydes that the descendants of Androklos, founder of Ephesus, ἐτι νῦν...ὀνομάζονται βασιλεῖς, ἔχοντες τινὰς τιμὰς, προέδραν τε ἐν ἀγῶσι καὶ πορφύραν ἐπίσημον τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους, σκίπταντα ἀντὶ σκήπτρου, καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς Ἐλευσινίας Διήμητρος. But, as Dittenberger has pointed out (*Syll.* i. 279, no. 175, 4 n.), it is doubtful whether these βασιλεῖς or βασιλῆαι (*Suid.* s.v. Πυθαγόρας Ἐφεσίος) can be identified with the Ἐσσηνες.

cular,' i.e. king of a certain definite wood, which in virtue of its importance had come to be known as the wood κατ' ἐξοχήν,<sup>1</sup> 'Nemi, imbedded in wood,' as Clough calls it in his *Amours de Voyage*. And 'king of Nemi,' as it is best translated, no more points to a departmental deity than 'king of Rome.' Had the Latins wished to imply 'king of all woodlands,' they would probably have said 'rex silvanus' rather than 'rex Nemorensis'; for the latter adjective has a distinctively local termination.<sup>2</sup>

These were the main objections that deterred Dr. Frazer from following up the analogy offered by the *rex sacrorum*, and they have broken down. We need not hesitate, then, to press that analogy and to conclude that the *rex Nemorensis* was in fact the religious successor of one who had been also a temporal king.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 199, n. 3 well observes: 'Auch die um das Heiligtum sich gruppierende Niederlassung heisst mit Eigennamen Nemus (Nēmos Strab. v. 239, App. b.c. v. 24), heute Nemi, ebenso wie sich aus dem *lucus Angitia* im Marserlande. . . die Gemeinde der Lucenses, heute Luco, entwickelte (Mommsen *C.I.L.* ix. p. 367).' Similarly at Teutheia in Achaia Artemis bore the cult-title of Νεμυδία (Strab. viii. 3. 11, 342 c.), which was presumably derived from a neighbouring νήμος. Thus Artemis Νεμυδία would be an exact parallel to Diana Nemorensis.

<sup>2</sup> *Roby Lat. Gram.* i. 300, section 815, Stolz *Hist. Gram. d. Lat. Spr.* i. 540 f.

<sup>3</sup> If the *rex sacrorum* was thus strictly parallel to the *rex Nemorensis*, it is tempting to ask whether certain points in the story of the early kings of Rome do not gain a fresh significance. Servius Tullius was born a slave (Dion. Hal. 4. 1). And the singular legend about his birth preserved by Plut. *de fort. Rom.* 10 and Dion. Hal. 4. 1-2 implies a close, indeed a vital, connexion between him and the royal hearth. Again, he was in a sense the champion of Diana: we have seen that he established her cult on the Aventine, and sacrificed a phenomenal cow in her honour. He lived near an ancient *Dianium* on the *Virbius clivus* (Liv. i. 48. 6, Solin. 1. 25), a hill leading up to the Fagatal of the Esquiline (Kiepert-Hülsem, map i. Ko). Finally, he was attacked in person by his successor L. Tarquinius, the son of *Egerius* (Dion. Hal. 4. 64), and put to the sword by his orders (Dion. Hal. 4. 39, Liv. i. 48. 4). Is this conjuncture of circumstances (slave yet king, connected with hearth, devoted to Diana, murdered by successor) and names (*Dianium*, *Virbius*, *Egerius*) purely accidental, or have we here scattered hints of a state of affairs really corresponding to the situation at Nemi? In view of variants on the reading *Virbium* in Liv. i. 48. 6 and Solin. i. 25 it would be rash to insist on the latter possibility. In Liv. i. 48. 6 *Virbium clivum* is the reading of the libri recitantes: *Urbium* is supported by codd. A C H I Voss. II.; *uerbium* stands in Lips., *uibium* in the frag. Flammersheimense. In Solin. 1. 25 too the best attested reading is *clivum Urbium*: cod. Sangallensis has *orbium*, and cod. Angelomontanus *olbium*. Nevertheless it is quite possible that the slope of the Esquiline was originally called 'clivus Virbius,' like the hill at Aricia (Pers. 6. 56 *clivumque ad Virbi*).

How does this conclusion affect our estimate of the *Golden Bough*? It certainly invalidates what I have called the framework of the book. If I am right, not only is the 'Golden Bough' a misnomer, but the whole explanation of the Arician cult given by Dr. Frazer falls to the ground. Yet (and I would lay stress on the fact) Dr. Frazer's work is much more than an attempted explanation of a single cult. He has undertaken—

*omne aeuom tribus explicare chartis  
doctis, Juppiter, et laboriosis,*

and we have still to examine the inferences here drawn from a vast array of facts relating to other cults and other climes. Unless I am much mistaken, the real value of the book will be found to lie not in the particular Arician hypothesis—that is wrong—but in the generalisations with regard to magic and early religion, many of which are undoubtedly right.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

*Numismatische Zeitschrift.* Vol. xxxiii. (for 1901) 1902.

Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur syrischen Münzkunde.' Rare or unpublished coins of Apamea on the Orontes, Karne, Ptolemais, Nikopolis, Emmaus, &c. The cultus-statue of Zeus Heliopolites seen between two oxen on the coins of Nikopolis is discussed.—J. Scholz. 'Griechische Münzen aus meiner Sammlung.'—A. Markl. 'Das Provinzialcourant unter Kaiser Claudius II. Gothicus.' On the coinage of Alexandria in Egypt.—O. Voetter. 'Die Münzen des Kaisers Gallienus und seiner Familie.' Continued from Vol. 32. With atlas of plates.—J. Maurice. 'L'atelier monétaire de Thessalonica pendant la période Constantinienne.'—O. Voetter. 'Hereuli und Jovi. Rathselhafte Abkürzungen auf gleichzeitigen Münzen des Constantinus in Lugdunum und des Licinius in Antiochia.'

*Revue belge de Numismatique.* Part 2, 1902.

A. Blanchet. 'Une émission de monnaies en Gaule sous Gallien en 262.'—Coins with reverses inscribed 'Deo Volcano,' 'Deo Marti,' and 'Deae Segetiae,' probably struck at Lyons at the time when

For, when the neighbouring *Dianium* disappeared (Liv. i. 48. 6 *ubi Dianium nuper fuit*), the name 'Virbius' would almost inevitably suffer corruption. It would naturally pass into 'Verbius' (in Pers. *loc. cit.* cod. C has *verbi*, and in Verg. *Aen.* 7. 762 cod. R has *Verbius*), or 'Urbius' from 'Urbs' = Rome, or 'Vibius' from the well-known gens, or 'Orbius' ('Opbius' cod. Vat. in Dion. Hal. 4. 39) to suit the tradition that Tullia there drove her chariot-wheels ('orbes') over her father's corpse (Fest. p. 182 Müller suggests derivation from the 'flexuosi orbes' of the hill), or 'Olbius' to form a contrast with the later name of the road, 'Vicinus Sceleratus' (Dion. Hal. 4. 39 οὗτος ὁ στενωπός, δλβιος καλούμενος πρότερον, ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ δεινοῦ καὶ μυσαροῦ πάθους ἀρεθῆς...καλεῖται).



the Empire was scourged by pestilence.—*Review.* Macdonald's *Catal. of Greek Coins*, Hunter Coll., vol. ii.

*Rivista italiana di Numismatica.* Vol. xv. Parts 1 and 2, 1902.

F. Gnechi. 'Appunti di numismatica Romana.' On some rare coins (*aes grave* &c.) from recent excavations in Rome.—G. Dattari. 'Appunti di numismatica Alessandrina.' On the classification of the Alexandrian coins of Saloninus and Valerianus junior.—J. Maurice. 'L'atelier monétaire d'Ostia pendant la période Constantinienne.'—A. Sambon. 'La cronologia delle monete di Neapolis.'—M.

Rostowzew. 'Tessere di piombo inedite e notevoli della collezione Francesco Gnechi a Milano.—R. Mowat. 'Le monnayage de Clodius Macer et les deniers de Galba marqués des lettres S. C.' A full descriptive list with illustrations of the coins of Macer, *propraetor* in Africa.—'Il Ripostoglio di Karnak.' A short notice of the recent remarkable find of Roman coins at Karnak near Luxor. The coins are Roman aurei, in perfect preservation, of the period from Hadrian to Diadumenian. They were contained in two terracotta jars, one of which held 1000, the other 180 specimens.

WARWICK WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

*American Journal of Philology.* Vol. xxii, 4. Whole No. 88. 1901.

A further collection of Latin Proverbs, M. C. Sutphen. *The Torch-Race*, J. R. S. Sterrett. *The Pomerium and Roma Quadrata*, S. B. Platner. *Etymologies*, G. Hemph. *Zurathustra and the Logos*, L. H. Mills. *Cicero's Judgment of Lucretius*, G. L. Hendrickson. *Cicero ad Atticum*, Louise Dodge. MAMATPAI, J. S. Speyer. The books noticed are Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters* (C. Johnston), Cumont's *Textes et Monuments Figurés Relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra* (G. Showerman), Oslander's *Hannibalweg* (E. B. Lease).

Vol. xxiii. No. 1. 1902.

*Problems in Greek Syntax*, Basil L. Gildersleeve. The editor defines his position as regards the aesthetics of syntax. *The Annals of Varro*, H. A. Sanders. *Word-Accent in Early Latin Verse*, J. J. Schlicher. A rehabilitation of the pitch accent in Latin. *A martyrological Fragment from Jerusalem*, E. J. Godspeed. *Plato's Testimony to Quantity and Accent*, A. N. Jannaris. *Note on the collation of Parisinus 7900A (of Horace) M. S. Slaughter*. Review, Reports, Brief Mention, etc.

*Hermes.* Vol. 37, 1. 1902.

W. Dittenberger, *die Familie des Alcibiades*. Proves that the pedigree-tree of Alcibiades as we have it shows that a generation has fallen out. He exhibits it as follows—Alcib. I. contemporary of Cleisthenes, his sons Kleinias I. trierarch at Salamis and Alcib. II. called *δ παλαιός* in Plat. *Euthyd.* 275A. The sons of the latter were Kleinias II., who was father of the celebrated Alcibiades and fell at Coronea in 446, and Axiochus. F. Leo, *Vergil und die Ciris*. Combats the view of Skutsch that Cornelius Gallus is the author of *Ciris*. L. concludes that the verses common to Vergil and the author of *Ciris* are borrowed by the latter, who published the poem after the *Aeneid*. A. Brieger, *Demokrits angebliche Leugnung der Sinneswahrheit*. Shows abundantly that D. believed the testimony of the senses. He only required that sense-perception should be completed and corrected by the understanding. U. Wilcken, *ein neuer Brief Hadrians*. Dates a letter in the Berlin Museum (No. 140), which he had previously ascribed to Trajan, in the year 119, and now ascribes it to Hadrian. W. K. Prentice, *die Basinschriften des Heiligtums auf dem Djebel Shékh Berekd*. Gives an account of an

expedition to this mountain N.W. of Aleppo. The inscriptions on the remains of a wall show that there was here a temple to Zeus Madbachos and Selamanes. We also have information given on the builder and the architect, the cost and the time of building. F. Hiller von Gaertringen und C. Robert, *Relief von dem Grabmal eines rhodischen Schulmeisters*. Description of this relief found in the neighbourhood of old Ialysus and now in Hiller's possession. It was probably the upper part of a door-entrance. The *ΤΑΞΙΟΙ*, to whose family the deceased belonged, probably were of the town Phoenix and are not the inhabitants of the Lycian town Tlos. M. Ihm, *eine lateinische Babriosübersetzung*. This is from the second vol. of the Amherst Papyri and is a translation of two fables of Babrios and part of a third in extremely bad Latin. W. Crönert, *Ormela*. On some linguistic peculiarities of inscriptions from Ormela which was a place on the borders of Pisidia and Phrygia. O. Seeck, *Zur Chronologie Constantins*. Opposes Mommsen's opinion as to the date of Constantine's becoming sole emperor and also Th. Preger's on the date of the foundation of Constantinople. Mommsen replies that Seeck's argument is consistent with his own opinion. G. Wissowa, *monatliche Geburtsfeier*. Refers *Verg. Ecl.* 1. 7 and 42 not to a Roman but to a Greek and oriental custom of celebrating the birthday of the monarch with monthly sacrifices. M. Ihm, *zur römischen Prosopographie*. Refers to some tile-inscriptions.

*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.* Vol. 57, 1. 1902.

*Ueber eine besondere Bedeutung von γάρ*, J. M. Stahl. In Thuc. iii. 40. 4 and 43. 4 γάρ neither gives a reason nor an explanation, but is rather concessive = 'it is true.' Other exx. of this meaning are given which accords with the derivation γε ἔπα. *Ueber den Verfasser der X libri de architectura*, H. Degering. Maintains against Using the authorship of Vitruvius and discusses the relationship of the work to Pliny. To be continued. *Zwei alte Terenzprobleme*, F. Schoell. On (1) the prologue to the *Heautontimorumenos* and (2) the narrative in the *Andria*. Zu Achilles Tatius, F. Wilhelm. Discusses the erotic literature of the ancients on the question as to whether the love of women or of boys is superior, and refers to Achilles Tatius. *Kaiser Marcus Salvius Otho*, L. Paul. An apology for Otho. His suicide is attributed to a desire to guard the Romans from civil war, also to want of confidence in himself as a

general. Aus dem zweite Bande der Amherst-Papyri, L. Radermacher. Discusses the contents of this volume. Attributes No. 1 to the 'Hector' of Astydamos. No. 17 is from a commentary of Aristarchus on Herodotus. Pap. xx. contains scholia to the Artemis-hymn of Callimachus. Die Inschrift der Aphaia aus Aigina, M. Fränkel. Shows that the *okos* of Aphaia must have stood in the temenos of Artemis. Zum 1. Strassburger Archilochos-Fragmente, O. Schulthess. *Dionys. de Lysia*, p. 32, 12 (p. 496 R.), L. Radermacher. Alters  $\delta\tau\delta$  (or  $\delta\tau\delta$ ) to  $\epsilon\tau\iota$ . Zu Pseudo-Sallusts *Invectiva*, F. Schoell. Die Verse des 'Vallegius' in der Vita Terentii, F. Schoell. Zu Ammianus Marcellinus, K. Zangemeister. In 30, 5, 19 reads *fulserat consue* for *pulserat consueto*. Zu dem sogenannten Lactantius Placidus, G. Knaack. Helm on *De Met.* vii. 762 refers to the commentator L. P., but there is no authority for his existence. Zu Avianus, P. v. Winterfeld. *Erstarre Flexion von Ortsnamen im Latein*, H. Zangemeister. Place-names in gen. acc. and abl. instead of in the nom. occur in good imperial times not only in itineraries but also in inscriptions and even in a Pompeian wall inscr. *Secus statt secundus und Aehnliches*, K. Zangemeister. Such forms are rather to be considered as vulgar-Latin than as contractions. *Divus Alexander*, H. Usener. Shows that the notice in Joh. Chrysost. xxvi. Homily, that the Roman senate named Alexander as the 13th Divus refers to Alexander Severus. Consequently before the death of Severus (235) and after 224 a reduction in the number of Divi must have taken place. Das Amphiktyonen-Gesetz von Jahre 380, L. Ziehen. Discusses the length of the lines of this inscr. and fills up gaps by conjecture.

# Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie. 1902.

28 May. Euripidis *Fabulae*, ed. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. *Troades* ed. N. Wecklein. *Hecuba* ed. alt. cur. N. Wecklein. (K. Busche), favourable. E. P. Morris, *On principles and methods in Latin Syntax* (H. Blase). 'A land-mark in the study of Latin syntax.' K. Vollmöller, *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie*, V. 2. (H. Ziemer), very favourable.

4 June. F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Kleinasiatische Münzen I.* (H. v. Fritze), very favourable. H. Pontow, *Delphische Chronologie* (H. Gillischewski), favourable. K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*. Mit einem Anhang über *Griechische Lexikographie* von L. Cohn. S. A. (Bartholomae). W. Vollbrecht, *Mäcenat* (A. Höck), favourable.

11 June. A. Nikitsky, *Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiet der griechischen Inschriften* (E. v. Stern), favourable. V. Costanzi, *Quaestiones chronologicae I. De Hellenici aetate definienda. II. Quo tempore Dareus Hystaspis filius ad Scythiam perdomandam profectus sit* (A. Höck), favourable. O. Schrohr, *De Eryzia qui fertur Platonis* (G. Wörpel), favourable. J. Podivinsky, *Die alten Classiker und die Bibel in Citalen* (F. H.), unfavourable.

18 June. E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. S. A. von H. Zimmermann und H. Winckler. I. (v. Präsek). 'A new edition of an epoch-making book.' E. Kammer, *Ein ästhetischer Kommentar zu Homers Ilias*. 2. A. (Karlowa). 'This new edition is re-arranged, but its excellences remain the same.' A. Hamilton. *The negative compounds in Greek* (J. Sittler), favourable. D. Tamila, *De Timothei Christiani et Aquilae Iudaei dialogo* (J. Draeske), favourable.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

- Allmann (W). *De architectura et ornamentis sarcophagorum*. Diss. Halle. 8vo. 39 S. u. 2. Abb.  
Apell (O.). Ein griechisches Lesebuch. Progr. Eisenach. 4to. 20 S.  
Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt. Rec., app. crit., comment., indices adjecerunt R. Schneider et G. Uhlig. I. II.: R. Schneideri comment. crit. et exegeticum in Apoll. scripta minora (Grammatici Graeci, I. II.) 8vo., iv. 274 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 16 M.  
Apollonius Rhodius. Knorr, A. De Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticorum fontibus quaestiones selectae. Diss. Leipzig. 8vo. 43 S.  
Aristotle. Syriani in Metaphysica commentaria. Ed. G. Kroll. 8vo. xiii. 221 pp. (Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca VI. 1) Berlin. Reimer. 9 M.  
Boor (C. de) 2. Bericht über eine Studienreise nach Italien zum Zwecke handschriftlicher Studien über byzantinische Chronisten. Akad. Berlin. 8vo. 19 S.  
Bürger (K.). Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Romans. I. Teil: Der Lukiosroman und seine literaturgeschichtliche Bedeutung. Progr. Blankenburg. 4to. 28 S.  
Cicero. Altenburg, O. Ciceros Tusculanen und die Lehrpläneinheit für das zweite Halbjahr der Gymnasialprima. Progr. Glogau. 4to. 19 S.  
— Rosenberg (E.) Studien zur Rede Ciceros für Murena. Progr. Hirschberg. 8vo. 29 S.

- Trabandt (A.) Ciceros Briefe als Schullektüre. Progr. Grandenz 1901. 8vo. 39 pp.  
Demosthenes. Ausgewählte Reden. Erklärt von A. Westermann. Band I. 10te. Aufl. bes. von E. Rosenberg. 8vo. 268 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 2.60 M.  
Diodorus Sic. Hultsch (Th.) Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Diodor von Sicilien. Progr. Paderborn. 4to. 12 S.  
— Kallenberg (H.) I. Textkritik und Sprachgebrauch Diodors. II. Der Hafen von Pylos. Progr. Berlin. 4to. 24 S.  
Euripides. Neubauer (R.) De interpolatione Heraclidarum fabulae Euripidae. Progr. Nordhausen. 4to. 13 S.  
Fabricius (E.) Ein Limesproblem (Extr. Festschrift der Universität Freiburg i. Baden). Royal 8vo. 25 pp., 1 plate. Freiburg. Fehsenfeld. 1 M.  
Furtwängler (A.) Ueber ein griechisches Giebelrelief (Extr. Abhandl. d. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.) 4to. Munich. Franz. Mk. 50 pf.  
Galen. Schöne (H.) Ein Palimpsestblatt des G. aus Bobbio. (Extr. Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad. der Wiss.) 8vo. 6 pp. Berlin G. Reimer. 50 Pf.  
Hirt (H.) Handbuch der griech. Laut- und Formenlehre. Eine Einführung in das sprachwiss. Studium des Griechischen. (Sammlung indo germanischer Lehrbücher: Grammatiken, Vol. II.) 8vo. xvi. 464 pp. Mk. 8.

- Homer.* Jöris (M.) Ueber Homerübertragung mit neuen Proben. Leipzig. 8vo. 70 S.
- Kalbfleisch (C.) Papyri Argentoratenses graecae. Progr. Rostock, 12 S. u. 4 Lichtdr.-Taf. 4to.
- Horace.* Vollbrecht (W.) Ueber eine neue Hypothese inbetreff der Herausgabe der Dichtungen des H. Progr. Altona. 4to. 19 pp.
- Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae.* Ed. B. Latyshev. Vol. IV. Supplementa continens per annos 1895-1900 collecta. 4to. x. 358 pp. Figures and plate. St. Petersburg, 1901, Voss. Mk. 30.
- Inscriptions.* Corpus inscriptionum graecarum Peloponnesi et insularum vicinarum. Vol. I. Inscriptiones graecae Aeginae, Pityonesiae, Cryphalidae, Argolidis. Ed. M. Fraenkel. Folio. viii. 411 pp. Mk. 48.
- Kern (O.) Inscriptionum thessalicarum antiquissimarum sylloge. Progr. Rostock 4to. 18 S. m. Abbild.
- Julius Pollux.* Michaelis (R.) Quae ratio intercedat inter Julii Pollucis onomasticon et Aristotelis de republica Atheniensium libri partem alteram. Progr. Berlin, 4to. 14 S.
- Luckenbach (H.)* Antike Kunstwerke im klassischen Unterricht. Progr. Karlsruhe, 4to. 52 S. m. Abb.
- Marcks,* Die mykenische Zeit im Geschichtsunterricht des Gymnasiums. Progr. 4to. 15 S. m. Abb.
- Matthias (F.)* Ueber Pytheas von Massilia und die ältesten Nachrichten von den Germanen. I. Teil. Progr. Berlin 1901. 8vo. 47 S.
- Methner (R.)* Die Darstellung der lateinischen Temporalsätze in der Obertertia. Anhang: Ueber die Bedeutung von postquam. Progr. Bromberg. 8vo. 47 S.
- Musonius.* Schmidt (C.) De arte rhetorica in Musonii diatriba conspicua. Freiburg Diss. 8vo. 78 pp. Mk. 1. 50.
- Nissen (H.)* Italische Landeskunde. Vol. II. Die Städte. Part I. 8vo. iv. 480 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. Mk. 7.
- Oehlschläger (F.)* Römische Ueberreste in Bayern, nach Berichten, Abbildungen und eigener Anschauung geschildert. Part I. 8vo. 96 pp. 3 maps. Munich. Lindauer. Mk. 5.
- Oracula Sibyllina.* Geffcken (J.) Komposition und Entstehungszeit der O. S. (Texte und Untersuchungen, Neue Folge, VIII. 1.) 8vo. IV. 78 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs. Mk. 2. 50.
- Ovid.* Gedichte. Auswahl. Hrsg. v. G. Tegge. Band I. Text und Kommentar. 8vo. xii. 153. III. 216 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. Mk. 3. 60.
- Papyri graecae musei Britannici et musei Bero-linensis* ed. a C. Kalbfleisch. Progr. 4to. 14 pp. 2 plates. Rostock, Warkentien. Mk. 2.
- Philo.* Opera quae supersunt edd. L. Cohn et P. Wendland. Vol. IV. 8vo. xxiv. 307 pp. Berlin, Reimer. Mk. 10.
- Knospe, S. Aristipps Erkenntnistheorie im platonischen Theätet. Progr. Grossstrelitz. 4to. 11 S.
- Polybius.* Herodot. R. La conception de l'histoire dans Polybe. Diss. Lausanne. 8vo. 164 S.
- Rickmann.* Zur lateinischen Tempuslehre. Progr. Güstrow. 4to. 23 S.
- Scheer (E.)* Theon und Sextion. Progr. Saar-brücken. 4to. 19 S.
- Schulz (J. G.)* Attische Verbal-Formen, alphabetisch zusammengestellt auf Grund von Autoren und Inschriften, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gymnasial-Classiker. Second Edition. 8vo. x. 123 pp. Prague, Storch. Mk. 1. 60.
- Sophocles.* Bolle (L.) Die Bühne des Sophokles. Progr. Wismar, 4to. 23 S.
- Tacitus.* Codex Laurentianus Mediceus 68 I et II phototypice editus. Praef. est H. Rostagno. (Codd. graeci et latini photographice depicti, Vol. VII.) 2 vols. folio, xx, 276. xx, 206 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. Mk. 300.
- Terence.* (Kampe.) Ueber die Adelphen des Terenz. Progr. Burg. 4to. 14 S.
- Virgil.* Gedichte erklärt von Th. Ladewig und C. Schaper. Bd. II. 12te Aufl. bes. von P. Deuticke. 8vo. vii, 294 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. Mk. 2.40.
- Georgii (H.) Die antike Vergilkritik in den Bukolika und Georgika. (Extr. Philologus, Ergänzungsband.) 8vo. Pp. 209-328. Leipzig, Dietrich. Mk. 3.60.
- Weyh (A.)* Die wichtigsten Mathematiker und Physiker des Altertums. Progr. Kreuzburg. 4to. 26 pp.
- Wessely (C.)* Karanis und Soknopion Nesos. Studien zur Geschichte antiker Cultur- und Personenverhältnisse. (Extr. Denkschr. d. k. Akad. der Wiss.) 4to. 171 pp. Vienna, Gerold. Mk. 9.80.
- Zimmermann (A.)* Zur Entstehung bzw. Entwicklung der Altrömischen Personennamen. Progr. Breslau. 4to. 20. pp.

